



Livestock Support for Climate Change Adaptation and Enhanced Resilience Project (LISCADERP) in Central African Republic

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11433

Countries

Central African Republic

Project Name

Livestock Support for Climate Change Adaptation and Enhanced Resilience Project (LISCADERP) in Central African Republic

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

10/23/2023

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

29Nov2023:

Cleared

22Nov2023:

The significant improvements are appreciated. Given the increased and consolidated focus on climate resilient livestock management, and noting component 2 is now the main focus of the project, and accounts for \$7.55 million of the LDCF funds, we suggest to break this up into a couple of (two different but complementary?) components, so the project would have a total of 4 components.

13Nov2023:

Although we appreciate the effort to "reformulate the significant proportion of the project to align it further with LDCF programming priorities", we note that all of the GEF project funds being sought by this project are from the LDCF, and therefore all of the project needs to be aligned with LDCF programming priorities and climate adaptation impact.

22Oct2023:

A) As currently formulated, this project is not sufficiently relevant for LDCF funding. Please see comments below on climate change adaptation design and other aspects.

B) Yes.

Agency's Comments

General comment noted and appreciated. Efforts have been made to reformulate the significant proportion of the project to align it further with LDCF programming priorities, but also bring to the fore adaptation challenges of the livestock sector in CAR.

November 20, 2023

The current version is now trimmed to three components all aligned to the LDCF programming priorities. The component on NbS in the previous version has been removed, and focus is on enabling environment, livestock value chains and access to financial resources, and M&E all geared to make livestock food systems and vulnerable communities depending on them more climate resilient.

November 24, 2023

As recommended, component 2 has been developed into two: Component 2: Strengthening gender-responsive community resilience by improving the resilience of livestock value chains and improved access to financial services (\$4,200,000); and Component 3: Enhancing gender-responsive financial investment flows to livestock and crop sectors for community adaptation (\$3,356,567). The texts in the document have been adjusted to reflect this change

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

29Nov2023:

Cleared

22Nov2023:

Thank you. With regards to comment and response I, please elaborate with some further information on the anticipated impacts of the optimistic and pessimistic scenario, as this PIF stage. We note the newly added text on page 11 that "The RCP 4.5 and RCP 8.5 climate scenarios were selected, and the defined project period is 2020-2050 and the period reference

1990-2015.[11]14", but we do not see elaboration on the anticipated impacts of climate hazards at RCP 8.5. Further analysis will certainly be important CER stage, but some further consideration is required at PIF, to ensure the solutions proposed are focused on the range of anticipated climate risks and impacts.

13Nov2023:

Thank you for providing a version of the PIF in the documents section that indicates what new text has been added. This is very helpful. Next time, please also indicate any text that has been deleted.

A) We note the new indication on page 3 that the RVFV "*virus causes severe illness and abortion in sheep, goats, and cattle as well as other domestic animals. The spread of RVFV is associated with climate change.*", *with one resource references*. Please explain why this is the case, and clarify specifically how this project will address this climate impact.

B) Component 1: Please clarify the scope of "resilience" of livestock and honey farming in CAR. Resilience to what? To climate risks, or resilience in general?

C) We note there seems to have been an expanded sectoral focus of this project in the resubmitted version of the PIF, from livestock to livestock and honey. However, this increased focus on honey projects is not adequately justified in the project documentation. For example, what is the correlation between the climate risk and solutions proposed in the project between the livestock and honey sectors? How do the climate risks and solutions across these sectors contribute to each other? Why are these 2 sectors grouped together in this project rather than other sectors? Etc.

D) We note the the indication on page 15 that *∇Honey value chains can support biodiversity conservation and promote pollination services, which are essential for crop production in the face of changing climatic conditions. By preserving and restoring natural habitats, beekeepers can contribute to ecosystem resilience and enhance the adaptive capacity of local communities, thereby fostering sustainable agricultural practices.*"

But this does not directly position this focus as a solution to climate risk and impacts, nor does it correlate the combined sectoral focus of

E) We note the added text on climate hazards on the bottom half of page 7. Please provide references for this new text.

F) The statement that "7% of the Central African population is affected by climate change" is frankly seems to be simplistic and not well researched, and continues to raise a concern about the logic behind this being a project to address this risk and impacts of climate change. Is this suggesting that 93% are not affected at all by climate change? That would be hard to believe, if one reviews literature across sectors in the region and documentation produced by and for CAR. This seems to be an especially inconsistent statement when we consider that a couple

of paragraphs later the PIF indicates that nearly 75% of the active population is employed in the agriculture sector. Further, what defines affected or not affected? Affected to what extent and how? Given the breadth of the sectors referred to in this same paragraph, how has the figure 7% been defined? This logic requires reformulation.

G) With regards to the table between pages 7 and 8, this also requires either reformulation or greater information to justify the claims.

i) How has the ranking of strong, medium, and weak been defined for sensitivity to cc, exposure to cc, and level of vulnerability? What is the data to support this analysis? What climate scenarios are being considered, and what is the timeline for these rankings?

ii) Further to this table, what is the logic between the relative rankings for sensitivity, exposure, adaptive capacity, and vulnerability? For example, Why the forest sector have the same rankings as the energy sector for all considerations, except the forest sector has stronger exposure to climate change?

iii) What has been considered to define the ranking of adaptive capacity by sector?

H) We note the new information about corn being the most climate effected crop. This raises the question of why this project is not focusing on the corn sector, and is rather focused on the livestock and honey sectors. Please consider and revise as relevant for focus on the greatest climate adaption and resilience impact possible.

I) We note the reference in a couple of locations that "by 2050 climate change will result in an increase in temperatures of between +1.31°C and +2.11°C according to the RCP 4.5 scenario". Please note the GEF STAP recommends, as indicated in point C below, 2 scenarios (optimistic and pessimistic), with the anticipation that CAR will have to adapt in between this range. RCP 4.5 is commonly considered an optimistic scenario, and RCP 8.5 pessimistic.

22Oct2023:

A) General: It is not clear that this is primarily a climate change adaptation project. Only limited information is provided about the current and anticipated risks of impacts of climate hazards that this project is trying to address. Several references are made to increased variability of rainfall, which is in fact consistent with publicly readily available climate information for the region, however the project does not provide sufficient information on how much rainfall is anticipated to vary, and the type and extent of impacts that are anticipated from this variance in specific timeframes. There is much greater and more consistent description and analysis provided on other critical, but non-directly climate related drivers of vulnerability of cattle herding households, including conflict, violence, political instability, poverty, deforestation, and illegal hunting, with only superficial references to the fact that climate change exacerbates these issues. While the interplay of these social, political

and economic factors with climate change is crucial, there is little to no consideration of how, to what extent, and in what expected timelines climate is exacerbating these factors.

B) General: Further, much of the limited information that is provided about current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards is inconsistent and does not clearly articulate the climate change adaptation problem that this project is designed to solve. For example, the project rationale section states "...a significant decrease of around 20 mm in annual precipitation from 1999" and in the same paragraph states "An increase of 12% to 19% is expected by the end of the century for precipitation...". Then, a couple of paragraphs later, this section states "over the last 30 years precipitation has been observed to have increased approximately 8%", and "medium-term projections do not indicate a change in total rainfall." but does not indicate what timeline is referred to as medium-term.

C) Defining the climate problem this project proposes to address: The climate change adaptation justification would have to be significantly strengthened for this project to be eligible for LDCF finance, including indication of current and anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards on cattle herding and ranching, referring to a optimistic and pessimistic set of climate scenarios, preferably looking 30 years into the future, given the focus and pace of adaptation will likely be required between the optimistic and pessimistic scenarios.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A: Comment well received, and it has helped us to be focused in terms of the information to provide to bring to the fore rainfall and temperature regimes at the national level, but also the project target Prefecture. A section, "National Overview of risks and vulnerability" has been added to respond to this comment. In this section maps and an analysis based on Climate Analytics data have been added, including a loss in crop productivity based on IFAD's Climate Adaptation in Rural Development Assessment Tool (CARD).

Response to B: In response to "comment B," efforts have been made to make the information more consistent. Additionally, additional information in the last two paragraphs of section A has been provided to succinctly highlight the adaptation challenges that livestock and honey value chains will contribute solving.

Response to C: Under the added section "National Overview of risks and vulnerability," another section has been added detailing the impacts of climate change on livestock production, and part of the information is excerpted from the country's National Adaptation Action Plan.

November 20, 2023

Response to A): Output 1.1.3 has been rephrased to focus on awareness raising campaigns on livestock disease outbreaks, including RVFV, improved capacity to forecast, improve surveillance, and response capacity to climate induced diseases. The awareness campaigns will equip communities with animal handling training participatory disease surveillance and reporting mechanisms for them to access veterinary extension services.

Response to B): On p.20 in the description of component 1, a sentence has been added to clarifying resilience to climate variability, disease outbreaks, and socio-economic instability.

Response to C): As noted above, the project focus has been recast onto livestock production only. This has helped to focus on livestock narrative only. In the project summary, p.9 and p.16, a clear rationale has been provided why the focus on livestock.

Response to D): As noted above, honey value chains have been deleted from the current version.

Response to E): Reference included from CAR's National Adaptation Action Plan.

Response to E): comment noted. It was inadvertently written as 7 instead of 75%. This has been corrected and reference provided.

Response to G): Comment is noted. A note has been added to say the information in the table has been excerpted from the government's official document. More information will be provided at PPG after additional thematic studies.

Response to i): As above, information provided has been excerpted from the country's NAP. Below the table on p.7, the process and methodological approach have been included. The reference and page number have been included.

Response to ii): Please, see response provided to i) above.

Response to iii): Please, see response provided to i) above.

Response to H): As has been alluded above, the project focus has been recast onto livestock production only. In the project summary, p.9 and p.16, a clear rationale has been provided why the focus on livestock.

Response to I): Comment is well noted. Information provided in the table on p.7 from the country's NAP has been derived taking into account optimistic and pessimistic scenarios. This specific section will however, be improved at PPG to provide more elaborate information for both optimistic and pessimistic scenarios.

November 24, 2023

As advised, additional information has been provided on p. 8-9 for the RCP8.5 scenario in CAR. As indicated, the section will benefit from additional analysis at CER.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

A) The additional information on after consultation at PPG is well noted. However, the project outputs do not currently seem to include a sufficient focus on youth to merit this explicit focus in the title. Please either revise the outcomes and outputs, or the title, accordingly.

B1) Will a digital platform be created, or just policies and institutional capacities review/assessment conducted towards potential eventual creation of a digital platform. Please clarify and reformulate as relevant.

B4) We note the response that "component 1 will be focused on TA 'adaptation software' interventions. However, this does not appear to be consistent with the set of outputs for this component as described on pages 19-20.

B4) What is the target population for the awareness campaigns?

B5) A description of this outcome is required at the PIF stage.

B6) What will the community revolving fund involve? How will it be financed and managed? Who will govern it? How will repayments be ensured and managed? What GEF finance will be allocated to this? How will its financial sustainability be ensured? Who will be the target population?

22Oct2023:

A) Although the title refers to youth, youth aspects are not sufficiently outlined in the current formulation of the PIF.

B1) Output 1.1.1 (ii): What is meant specifically by "develop digital tools to facilitate the transhumance policy by capitalizing on the dynamics in West Africa". E.g. What digital tools, how will they facilitate transhumance policy, etc.? Please clarify.

B2) Please provide a brief description of all Outputs (not just outcomes).

B3) Outcome 1.1: How will this output "enhance its meteorological and early warning systems to better predict extreme weather events and inform disaster preparedness."?

B4) Outcome 1.1: This outcome seems to be striving to do an unrealistically large amount with limited budget. Please consider how it is best to focus on what is feasible to succeed with the budget allocated to this output.

B5) Outcome 2.1: Please provide an explanation for this outcome, including an explanation of how it will improve access to financial services, what private sector partners will be engaged in doing so, how accessible terms for any loans to producers will be ensured, and how financial literacy challenges of herders will be addressed.

B6) Outcome 2.2: How will climate-proof local infrastructure such as roads and storage facilities, to facilitate the transportation and storage of livestock and honey products" result in the stated outcome of "access to access to financial services through community level financial service provision." Similar question for "A robust regulatory framework to ensure product quality and safety to bolster these value chains will also be supported." This outcome seems to be a broad grab bag. Please provide greater focus to ensure success of all elements.

B7) Outcome 2.3: What is being referred to specifically by the "'Pass On the Gift' approach"?

B8) Outcome 3.1: it is well noted that that "uncontrolled exploitation of forest resources, unsustainable agricultural practices, and significant loss of biodiversity, land degradation and deforestation are important challenges in CAR". However, this outcome does not link these resource managements challenges with the climate project. In effort to illustrate the importance of the comments above about only value consideration of climate adaptation project this project intended to address, this is another good example of an outcome that is absent of a clear and direct focus on current and anticipated climate impacts and how they related to other challenges in the country. Please reformulate.

Agency's Comments

Response to A: Comment is noted, and in response, additional information has been provided in Section A. After additional consultation at PPG, additional information will be provided to improve youth information representation in the document.

Response to B1): The output has been rephrased to improve its readability as, ?Two (2) policies and institutional capacity review/assessment conducted to i) mainstream climate resilience in the livestock sector; and ii) develop digital platform to facilitate the implementation of the transhumance policy considering the socioeconomic and politics dynamics in the neighbouring countries.

Response to B2): Mindful of the word count, a brief description has been provided for all the outputs.

Response to B3): With explanation provided, the reference to quoted sentence has been deleted.

Response to B4): The comment is well appreciated. At this stage, and in response to stakeholder expressed needs, component 1 will be focused on TA ?adaptation software? interventions. The budget provided at seems sufficient to support policies reviews, development of a livestock sector investment plan, conducting awareness campaigns, establishment of community-led disaster response committees and developing a digital platform

Response to B5): The comment is well noted and appreciated. In response, additional information has been provided under component 2. Additional information will certainly be provided after further engagement with stakeholders and when activities are more refined following stakeholder consultations.

Response to B6): In response to this comment, allusion to climate-proofing of local infrastructure and robust regulatory framework to ensure product quality and safety to bolster these value chains will also be supported have been deleted.

Response to B7): Pass on Gift approach has been defined in the document as an approach where each assisted family helps another family obtain the same or similar benefits. This is most commonly achieved when an original recipient of an animal raises one or more female offspring and, with guidance and approval from the local group, gives the young animal and training to another family.

Response to B8): The comment is well noted, and the outcome has been rephrased and a paragraph has been added under component 3 that clarifies that link between NbS and adaptive capacity development

November 21, 2023

Response to A): One of the big changes includes the change of the proposal title, besides focusing on livestock.

Response to B1): As requested it is clarified under output 1.1.1 that the policy review and assessment will inform the development of a digital platform.

Response to B4): The category has been changed from TA to ?TA and Investment.? This is also mentioned in the description of component 1 on p.21

Response to B4): The target population is estimated at 150,000 rationalised that all direct beneficiaries will be engagement during awareness raising campaigns. This output has also be changed to focus on livestock-related topics.

Response to B5): As recommended, all the outcomes have briefly been described.

Response to B6): Comment appreciated. In response, information has been provided on p.22 under the description of output 2.1.1

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

A) As indicated in the comment made on 22 October, please strengthen the gender dimensions at the PIF stage.

B) In addition to the points below, please ensure gender dimensions are appropriately reflected in Outputs 1.1.3; 1.1.4; 2.2.1; 2.2.2.

22Oct2023:

Although the PIF includes a paragraph that provides information on things like salary discrepancies among public servants, it provides no information about gender issues in the target population of people living in agrosilvopastoral landscapes (as stated in the project objective, and gender issues as related to cattle ranching and herding. Please provide an analysis of gender dynamics, challenges, and opportunities related to cattle ranching and herder households, and the broader stated target population of people living in agrosilvopastoral landscapes. The gender dimensions need to be strengthened in line with GEF's Policy and PIF Guidance.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

The comment is well appreciated. It is true that much of the information provided does not sufficiently highlight the gender dynamics in the target Prefectures. This will be done at PPG when the proposal will have a better opportunity to conduct thematic studies, including gender dynamics in the target Prefectures

November 21, 2023

Response to A): As requested, a more detailed gender dimension has been provided from p. 14 ? 21

Response to B): As recommended, gender dimensions are reflected in the mentioned outputs

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$29,232,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,461,000 instead of \$ 1,218,000 (which is 4.1%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

22Oct2023:

A) Greater focus with some of the outcomes is needed. Please see comments above as examples and consider greater focus throughout.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A): Comment noted with thanks. Please, refer to associated responses provided above.

November 21, 2023

Response: Amended as suggested. PMC cofinancing is now \$1,461,000

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

A) This comment is not yet fully addressed. Please note further comments above.

B) Please indicate what text has been changed within the table of barriers on page 14 or elsewhere in the document. Please also indicate how each barrier will be enabled to be addressed, preferably within the same table.

22Oct2023:

A) Not for climate related situation, and their relationship with non-climate related socioeconomic factors. Please see comments above.

B) With regards to the table on barriers, some are overly vague. For example, what is meant by "Lack of technical capacities and resources at district level (knowledge and resources)"? What technical capacities specifically, to do what specifically, why does this matter specifically, and what does this have to do with the climate problem specifically? Generalities of this nature need to be addressed. The same could be said for "Inadequate cross-sectoral coordination, with limited participation of women in relevant decision making." Also, it is not clear how the project interventions, as currently designed, will address all of these barriers. Please revise this table to have the stated barriers more consistently specific, and the project outcomes and outputs as relevant to ensure they will address the specific barriers.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A): Please refer to responses provided above, particularly under Project Summary, response C.

Response to B): The comment is well noted, and in response, the table has been revised to align the barriers to the components. Under each barrier, at both national and community level, relevant components that will address the barriers have been added.

November 21, 2023

Response to A): Please, refer to responses provided above.

Response to B): As recommended, information has been included how the barriers in the table will be addressed per component.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

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

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

28Nov2023:

Cleared at this stage.

Prior to CER Endorsement, it will be necessary to detail the strategy for providing de-risking finance from this project for commercial finance institutions to create lines of credit for lending products at relatively accessible terms, coupled with technical assistance to producers on adaptation and resilience solutions, as well as to the FIs on how to target and monitor climate adaptation and resilience impacts in their lending products, as referred to in the GEF-8 strategy for climate change adaptation. We encourage collaboration on this component with the IFAD projects supported by LDCF and SCCF with your GEF approved partners of BNP Paribas and Fondation Grameen Credit Agricole.

27Nov2023:

As indicated in the comment below, please include least initial reference to these considerations and elements in the PIF, which will be further analyzed to provide further specificity in the CER.

22Nov2023:

Please note that the comment and response D about the role of finance and microfinance institutions to enable access to capital for livestock producers to transition to climate resilient practices will need to be further elaborated during PPG and prior to CEO Endorsement. As referred to in the GEF-8 strategy for climate change adaptation, we recommend considering approaches to providing de-risking finance from this project for commercial finance institutions to create lines of credit for lending products at relatively accessible terms, coupled with technical assistance to producers on adaptation and resilience solutions, as well as to the FIs on how to target and monitor climate adaptation and resilience impacts in their lending products. We encourage collaboration on this component with the IFAD projects supported by LDCF and SCCF with your GEF approved partners of BNP Paribas and Fondation Grameen Credit Agricole. Please include least initial reference to these considerations and elements in the PIF, for further analysis and specificity in the CER.

13Nov2023:

A) This comment has been partially but not fully addressed. Please see comment above.

B1) This comment has been partially but not fully addressed. Please see comment above.

D) We appreciate the indication of "Credit Mutuel du Centrafrique, Caisses d'Epargne et de Credit de Lutte contre la Pauvre?". Are there other financial institutions that can be engaged in the project? Please ensure their role "To develop financing packages that are responsive to the needs of livestock producers, small-scale farmers and entrepreneurs to establish their access to credit" is fully reflected in the project outputs, and the budget

reflecting project support to enable contribution of these FIs, through guarantees, technical assistance, or otherwise.

22Oct2023:

A) Only minimal. Please strengthen.

B1) Not as related to climate changes in the drivers.

B2) Also, please include consideration of how anticipated changes in the security and economic situation is expected to effect resilience of the target population.

C) Not with regards to previous and ongoing climate change adaptation oriented plans and projects.

D1) No. Please describe anticipated roles of relevant public and private institutions and companies, as well as civil society organizations. Given the stated focus of the project on financial services, please outline the roles of specific public and private partners in doing so, or revise the project outcomes accordingly.

D2) While a list of stakeholders consulted, dates and what was discussed has been provided, there is no description to their potential role in the achievement of the project objectives. Reference has been made to detailed information in the project description, but this is not there. Please provide a list who, when and how these stakeholders will be engaged and consulted during the project development stage.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A): Comment well noted, and in response, additional information has been provided to show why the project's approach has been selected over potential options.

Response to B1): Substantial changes have been done to the document to clarify the climate change context in terms of historical data and projected changes. This has been noted above (see response to section 2 above **Project Summary**).

Response to B2): A paragraph (just before the subsection on political factors) has been added based on World Bank data to indicate how the security and economic situation is likely to affect the resilience of the target population.

Response to C): As recommended, a paragraph under the baseline project has been added to show how the proposed project will build on the ongoing/previous investments. It should be mentioned that more information will be provided at PPG after additional consultation with development partners and other stakeholders.

Response to D1): In response, and also taking into account the context in CAR, additional information has been provided. As indicated in the document, the context can quickly change in the country and alter the private sector landscape (which is already limited) ? therefore, more information will be provided at PPG after additional consultation are conducted.

Response to D2): The comment is noted and appreciated. In response, and mindful of the word count, additional information has been provided and the table of stakeholders updated. Additional information will be provided at PPG

November 21, 2023

Response A): As alluded above, the project has been recast to focus on livestock production and the rationale for this prioritization.

Response B1): Overall, the project has identified and tabulated barriers which constrain resilience and adaptive capacities of the livestock sector. Above and below the table of barriers and how the project will respond to them on p.22, texts have been added that clarify how the project has been designed to respond to future drivers.

Response D): As recommended, this is reflected with an additional specific output 2.2.3. It is possible that there are other financial institutions that the project can work with. For a start at PIF stage, the ones mentioned have been identified, and others will identified at PPG during additional stakeholder consultations.

November 24, 2023.

The comment is well noted and appreciated. At PPG, this will be taken on board as one of the key areas requiring additional development

November 28, 2023

Response: The comment and recommendation have been well received. As guided, a paragraph under component 3 on p.32-33 has been added. This will be further explored at PPG.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

13Nov2023:

Addressed

22Oct2023:

A) No there is not.

B) No. Please describe all outputs and please address all comments above on outcomes and outputs.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A): The comment is noted, and the project will include a diagram at PPG to provide an illustration of the information on the theory of change that has been provided in Section B (Project Description), including an explanation of the envisaged pathway.

Response to B): As recommended, and noted above, outputs have been described.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

28Nov2023:

Recommended for technical clearance.

27Nov2023:

Please address remaining comment.

22Nov2023:

Please address remaining comments.

13Nov2023:

Please address all further comments.

22Oct2023:

Please address all comments above.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

The comment is noted with thanks. Efforts have been made to respond to the comments above, minding the word count but also the opportunity to provide additional information at PPG after thematic studies and additional consultations with stakeholders that been conducted.

November 20, 2023

Response: As recommended, additional information has been provided in the table on p.32 with a sentence above the table. This information will be complemented at PPG after confirming the activities of the project.

November 28, 2023

Response: Addressed, please above

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

- a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?
- b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).
- c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area
- d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

13Nov2023:

Cleared

22Oct2023:

It appears this section has not been completed. Please do so.

Agency's Comments

- a) Text has been added on the envisaged institutional setting
- b) N/A
- c) The information on coordination and cooperation with GEF projects and other projects/programs was shifted to this section.
- d) Additional text on knowledge dissemination was added.

Please double check the letter as it is in the correct format

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Apologies for the confusion. Cleared.

13Nov2023:

For the core indicators section, why are the set of core indicators for climate change adaptation (financed through the LDCF and SCCF) being used? Please note the results framework attached was for GEF7, rather than GEF8.

22Oct2023:

A1) Given the project indication that there are around 25,000 cattle herders in the country, please explain the logic of this project directly benefitting 30,000 families, or adjust the figures accordingly.

A2) Additionally, we note there is a factor of 6 applied to the number of household and people impacted, which we assume to suggest that the average household size of people involved in herding is 6. Please provide evidence to support this.

B) Please include the figure for core indicator 5 (number of private sector actors engaged).

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A1): Comment noted with thanks. As recommended, the number has been revised to 25,000 families.

Response to A2): data is from the United Nations HH size and composition 2022 (Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS data)) which has been rounded off to 6 from 5.59.

Response to B): As reminded, the number has been included as 6 ([Telceec CAR](#), [Orange CAR](#), [Azur CAR](#) [Credit Mutuel du Centrafrique](#), [Caisses d'Epargne et de Credit de Lutte contre la Pauvret?](#)).

November 20, 2023

Sorry we don't understand this question, the LDCF core indicators have been provided

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

A) Please indicate where in the document this paragraph was added. Although the response about word limits are well noted, please also note these limited are meant as guidance but not absolutes. Further, this is a good deal of text in the PIF that is not central to the focus of the project and could be deleted to reduce overall length.

B) Please indicate where in the document this paragraph was added. Although the response about word limits are well noted, please also note these limited are meant as guidance but not absolutes. Further, this is a good deal of text in the PIF that is not central to the focus of the project and could be deleted to reduce overall length.

22Oct2023:

A) No. Financial sustainability of the project is not adequately considered.

B) Please strengthen the scale up aspects of the project.

C) Yes

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

Response to A): The comment is well appreciated, and efforts will be made to integrate financial sustainability at PPG. However, mindful of the word count, but also the current template of the PIF, a paragraph has been provided to demonstrate how the project will ensure financial sustainability ? this will be improved at PPG.

Response to B): As requested, additional information has been added to strengthen scaling up. As above, due to word count and template structure, more information will be provided at PPG.

November 21, 2023 Response to A): Additional information has been provided on p.37 to demonstrate the project plan for financial sustainability at PIF level. Response to B): Additional information has been provided

November 21, 2023

Response to A): Additional information has been provided on p.37 to demonstrate the project plan for financial sustainability at PIF level.

Response to B): Additional information has been provided

on p.37 to demonstrate the project plan for financial sustainability at PIF level.

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

23Nov2023:

Only partially addressed. Please note comments above.

22Oct2023:

No. Please see the comments above on climate change adaptation priorities.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

As noted above, efforts have been made to clarify the climate change adaptation context.

November 21, 2023

Response: Please refer to responses to comments above

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

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

23Nov2023:

Please indicate where in the PIF this additional information has been provided.

22Oct2023:

The project does not sufficiently describe how it aligns with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

As requested, additional information has been provided to describe how the project is aligned with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans.

November 21, 2023

Response: Please refer to p.40-41

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

13Nov2023:

Cleared

22Oct2023:

No. Given this project is indicated as contributing to biodiversity, please explain and justify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s).

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

The comment is well noted. The document has information that indicates how the project is aligned with Target 2, Goal B, Target 10 and Target 11 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework ? the project contributes to these essentially through component 3 that is dedicated to ecosystem restoration. Also, the document has a table (p.32) that summarizes how the project is aligned with LDCF GEF-8 programming. This could be further clarified at PPG.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments N?A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Well noted and cleared at this stage.

13Nov2023:

This comment is provided for the PIF stage. Please address as such.

22Oct2023:

Please endeavor to provide multiple sources of co-finance.

Agency's Comments

This is well noted, we will endeavor in seeking additional cofinancing from other sources during the PPG phase at this stage

November 21, 2023

Response: As previously indicated, the comment was noted and well taken. The Agency and the government are working closely together Please refer to p.40-41

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

Letter of Endorsement only includes the Ministry of Livestock and Animal Health as the Executing Partner. However, in the CER document there is an additional executing partner (Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security) that is not included in the LoE. Please clarify, by removing the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security as it is not endorsed by the Government, or otherwise.

Agency's Comments

November 21, 2023

Response: As recommended, the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security has been removed from the table

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

22Nov2023:

Cleared

13Nov2023:

The project overall ESS risk is classified as high/substantial in the Portal and indicates that additional assessment will be conducted to determine the development of an ESMF during project preparation or implementation at PPG. However, the attached Environmental and Social Screening and rating documents indicates the project environmental and social risks are Category B, moderate risk. Please make these risk rating consistent and provide consistent environmental and social risk assessment.

Agency's Comments

November 21, 2023

Response: As recommended, the risk rating has been made consistent, and is now Moderate in the portal as is in the document.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

22Oct2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project 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. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

28Nov2023:

Recommended for technical clearance.

27Nov2023:

Not quite, but it is close.

22Oct2023:

No. Unfortunately, this PIF would require significant reformulation to be recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

November 05, 2023

The comment is well noted. Efforts have been made to respond to the comments, significantly reformulating certain sections in the attempt to respond to the recommendations. Additional information will be provided at PPG after thematic studies and additional consultations with stakeholders in a very complex country context.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments As referred to in the GEF-8 strategy for climate change adaptation, prior to CER endorsement it will be necessary to define approaches to providing de-risking finance from this project for commercial finance institutions to create lines of credit for lending products at relatively accessible terms, coupled with technical assistance to producers on adaptation and resilience solutions, as well as to the FIs on how to target and monitor climate adaptation and resilience impacts in their lending products. We encourage collaboration on this component with the IFAD projects supported by LDCF and SCCF with your GEF approved partners of BNP Paribas and Foundation Grameen Credit Agricole.

Agency's Comments

November 28, 2023

Response: As noted above, the comment and suggestions have been received with appreciation - and a paragraph under component 3 on p.32-33 has been added. This will be further explored at PPG.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/25/2023	10/22/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/13/2023	11/13/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/22/2023	11/22/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/27/2023	11/24/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/29/2023	11/28/2023