



A Holistic Approach to Food Systems Resilience and Adaptation in Maldives

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11411

Countries

Maldives

Project Name

A Holistic Approach to Food Systems Resilience and Adaptation in Maldives

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

11/27/2023

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

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

10/24/23:

Yes, the project meets eligibility criteria for SCCF-A. Yes, the General Project Information table has been correctly populated.

Agency's Comments

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 10/24/23:

Yes. The project will focus on food security in the Maldives in the context of multiple climate change threats the country faces by virtue of being a SIDS.

Agency's Comments

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 10/24/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/23:

Cleared for PIF stage.

10/24/23:

Not yet. Please address the following:

Gender:

(i) How is climate change likely to exacerbate stresses and vulnerabilities of women at the project locations? How is the project proposing to enhance women's resilience in this context?

(ii) Please ensure that gender dimensions are incorporated in components 1,2,3 and 5 as well as in the M & E systems.

Agency's Comments Gender dimensions are an important consideration under the project. The impact of climate change on gender has been further detailed and incorporated into the project components.

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 11/27/23:

Cleared.

10/24/23:

Adjustments are requested.

a) Please allocate a relatively greater share of the requested project grant to activities that offer tangible, on-the-ground adaptation actions at scale to improve the climate resilience of communities.

b) Yes, the GEF project financing and co-financing contributions to PMC are proportional.

c) Yes, PMC is within 5% of the GEF grant.

Agency's Comments

a) Adjustments made to allocate a larger share of the project financing to tangible actions.

b) Funds have been reallocated from component 1 to component 4

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

12/4/23:

Cleared.

11/27/23:

Adjustment and further explanation is requested.

Please remove all seven statements requesting to "see figure in attached PIF". The LDCF/SCCF Council will only be viewing the Portal entry, so it is important to present the most relevant figures in the Portal entry itself. For cases where the figure can not be uploaded, please ensure a clear discussion is provided in the Portal text of the observed trend and the climate projections (for two different scenarios, e.g., mid-range and worst case), .

10/24/23:

Needs further attention.

Several relevant figures are missing pertaining to climate change projections for key variables. The agency is kindly requested to liaise with the Portal team to ensure that all figures are uploaded and displaying properly. Projections for at least two scenarios should be provided for temperature, rainfall, and sea level rise, with references provided.

Agency's Comments

Thank you for the comment. The most relevant figures have been uploaded in the portal and all seven statements referring to the PIF have been removed, as advised.

Climate change projection for temperature, rainfall and sea level rise have been added.

However, due to the tight page limit, it is not possible to add more figures and images related to climate projections. Some of the figures are included in the PIF.

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 10/26/23:

Yes for PIF stage.

By CEO endorsement, please provide further details on stakeholder engagement, especially civil society.

Agency's Comments More details on stakeholder engagements, including civil society, have been added. Additional details will be provided during the PPG phase

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 10/26/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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 10/24/23:

Yes, the project is based on additional adaptation reasoning.

Agency's Comments

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 11/27/23:

Cleared.

10/26/23:

Further information is requested:

a) Please discuss the institutional coordination arrangements for the project.

c) Yes, cleared.

d) Yes.

Agency's Comments a) FAO will be the GEF implementing agency. Ministry of Fisheries, Marine Resources and Agriculture will be the lead executing agency, in partnership with the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change and Technology. A Project Steering Committee and a Project Management Unit will be set up. Further details on the institutional structure will be elaborated during the PPG phase.

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

11/27/23:

Cleared for PIF stage.

Thank you for explaining that the high ratio of male to female beneficiaries for Core indicators 1 and 4 is due to the fact that in Maldives, fisherfolk are predominantly men. Please ensure by CEO endorsement that the project also takes meaningful measures to enhance the climate resilience of a significant number of women and girls in these

communities. We would like the ratio of male to female beneficiaries and people trained to be more evenly balanced than presented at PIF stage.

We are pleased to see the project expects to mainstream climate resilience in 11 policies and plans. Please provide further detail by CEO endorsement.

10/24/23:

Adjustments are requested.

- a) The proposed number of beneficiaries is 5,751. Please clarify what percentage this number is of the combined population of the Laamu, Gaafu Alifu, Gaafu Dhaalu, Gnaviyani and Seenu atolls.
- b) The core indicators table shows that 4,038 male beneficiaries (70%) and 1,713 female beneficiaries (30%) are expected for the project. This ratio is not in line with the GEF-8 Adaptation Strategy, which aspires for SCCF projects to deliver direct adaptation benefits to both women and men equally, to the extent possible/feasible. Please adjust/discuss. The same comment applied to core indicator 4.

Agency's Comments

a) Total number of direct beneficiaries

Total: 5751 (9% of resident Maldivian population in project area)

Male: 4038 (63% in fisheries; 37% in agriculture)

Female: 1713 (all agriculture)

% for Women: 30

Though no adjustments have been made for core indicator 1 more detail and justification has been provided. Core indicator 4 numbers have been slightly revised to 35% for women. There is a higher number of male beneficiaries as the fisheries sector in Maldives is male dominated.

b) The proposed number of beneficiaries represents only the registered direct beneficiaries. As the sectors are highly informal, with a large number of unregistered beneficiaries, it is expected that the total number (including the unregistered ones) will be substantially higher. A realistic number will be documented during the implementation phase of the project.

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

Secretariat's Comments 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 10/24/23:

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 10/24/23:

Yes.

Re: (c), the project will support mechanisms for inter-sectoral cooperation; and improved governance, planning and zoning, among other actions.

Agency's Comments

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 10/24/23:

Yes, it is aligned with the GEF-8 Adaptation Strategy for SCCF-A, which supports climate change adaptation in non-LDC SIDS.

Agency's Comments

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 10/24/23:

Yes, it is aligned with the Maldives Climate Change Policy Framework (2015-25) and other relevant strategic national strategies and policies.

Agency's Comments

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 n/a

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/23:

Cleared.

10/26/2023:

No. Further information is requested on Gender. The description of the role of the private sector is missing. Regarding stakeholder engagement, please consult local CSOs during project preparation and please ensure that civil society is actively engaged in project implementation.

Agency's Comments

More information on gender mainstreaming and role in the project has been incorporated to the PIF.

The private sector has a key role in the project, and this is detailed under component 2 and in section B.

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

Secretariat's Comments 11/27/23:

Cleared.

10/26/23:

Not yet.

- (i) Please include dates with the list of stakeholders consulted.
- (ii) Please provide the of list of organizations, CSO, CBOs and consulted in project design.

Agency's Comments Details of stakeholder engagements during the PIF phase has been added and more in-depth engagement and discussion with a range of stakeholder will take place during the PPG phase.

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 n/a

Agency's Comments
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments 10/24/23:
Yes.

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 10/24/23:

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 10/24/23:

Yes for PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (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 10/24/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments 10/24/23:

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 11/27/23:

Cleared.

10/24/23:

Further information is requested.

The Letter of Endorsement (LoE) that has been uploaded and signed by the OFP has not used the correct LoE template, which should include a footnote that states: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?. This footnote is missing from the uploaded version.

The LoE also has left blank the "focal area source" column in the table. It should state "Climate change".

Recommended action: Please ask the OFP to send an email, to be uploaded by the Agency to the portal Document section, stating that she accepts the footnote on the original template and specifies that the 'focal area source' entry for the table is ?Climate Change?.

Agency's Comments A revised LoE has been submitted.

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 11/27/23:

Cleared. Please note that only the Portal entry will be reviewed by the GEF Council and thus needs to contain all requested information. However, relevant maps and georeferencing has been provided.

10/24/23:

Please provide a higher-resolution map, if possible. Please contact ITS for assistance on inclusion of maps and other figures in the Portal.

Agency's Comments the maps have been uploaded in relevant sections and in the annex. However, due to page limits, it is not possible to upload all in the portal. They are included in the PIF document.

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 11/27/23:

Cleared.

10/24/23:

Further information is requested.

The Agency has attached only the Risk Certification. The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and it is not clear what actions FAO will take during the PPG phase. Please provide plans for further environmental and social impact assessment and development of environmental and social management plan to avoid, minimize and mitigate the impacts during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

The revised comprehensive FAO safeguards screening checklist has been uploaded.

As a moderate-risk project, relevant instruments under the FAO *Framework for Environmental and Social Management* will be applied.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments 10/24/23:

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 10/24/23:

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 12/4/23:

Yes.

11/27/23:

Not yet. The agency is requested to kindly address the remaining review comment.

10/27/23:

Not yet. The agency is requested to kindly address the review comments.

Agency's Comments All comments have been addressed

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

Secretariat's Comments 1) The link between climate change projections and impacts on fisheries and agriculture in the Maldives needs to be much more detailed and substantiated by CEO endorsement stage.

2) Please ensure that local CSOs are consulted during project preparation and that CSOs will be engaged in project implementation.

3) Please endeavor to mobilize some investment co-finance.

4) Gender: Please ensure that a clear discussion is presented by CEO endorsement on climate vulnerability of women and other vulnerable groups and how the project will address this.

5) Please ensure by CEO endorsement that the project also takes meaningful measures to enhance the climate resilience of a significant number of women and girls in these communities. We would like the ratio of male to female beneficiaries and people trained to be more evenly balanced than presented at PIF stage.

Agency's Comments Thank you for sharing these suggestions. They are well noted and will be taken into consideration during the CEO endorsement stage.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/4/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)