

# Climate Resilient Growth and Adaptation in Democratic Republic of Congo

[Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement](#)

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9392

**Countries**

Congo DR

**Project Name**

Climate Resilient Growth and Adaptation in Democratic Republic of Congo

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

2/28/2020

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**

**CEO Endorsement**

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Yes. Project intervention areas within each of the provinces have been specified, with corresponding changes to provide more detail and refinement related to the local contexts. The order of component 2 outputs have been modified for more logical flow. A third project output has been added for stronger results based management. Adequate justification is provided for the changes.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9 March 2020:**

Please note the set of comments in response to question 8 below, particularly in regards to avoiding duplication and maximising synergies with the GCF funded adaptation planning support also to be implemented by the UNDP in DRC. As also indicated in question 8 below, please clarify which outputs will be produced only in the three provinces, which will be produced nationally, and which will be produced in both levels. This is important to understand the scope and budget implications.

Section 1.2.2 discusses climate hazards and in doing so highlights the risk of increased water-borne diseases and the high vulnerability of the health sector to climate change, but it appears there are no specific outputs or activities to address this challenge. To the extent possible, we encourage further consideration of how the project will increase adaptive capacity of the health sector, particularly to address water-borne diseases.

With regards to output 1.2, in addition to building the platform, please ensure adequate focus and resources are dedicated to management of the platform. Please clarify the financial sustainability strategy for ongoing management of the platform. Furthermore, please ensure explicit focus on protocols for how the information will be used for local decision making, and orientation of end-users of platform protocols on how the information is used for local decision making (within this output and/or integrated into others).

With regards to output 2.4, please ensure (i) selection of businesses supported with consideration of their likely impact on climate resilience and adaptation; (ii) focus on creation of opportunities to finance climate adaptation oriented businesses instead of just TA to develop them (e.g. financial matchmaking with private investors; working with microfinance sector or others to create interest and lines of credit for climate resilience; etc); (iii) some focus on storage facilities related enterprises, given the document includes a few references to challenges with getting agriculture products to market due to poor storage facilities and infrastructure.

Please ensure active consideration of traditional practices that are conducive to climate resilience, and how specific traditional practices can be broadened or otherwise supported through this project for adaptation outcomes, including as they relate to herding practices.

With regards to Institutional Arrangements and Coordination (A.6), to ensure clarity and common understanding, please revise this section to use GEF terminology of Implementing Agency (UNDP) and Executing Partner (DDD of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development).

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

\$444,000 seems high for "equipment and furniture" (see note 9 in budget section of UNDP Prodoc). Please provide detail on the need and description of "motorbikes for master trainers" for activity 2.1.1, including how many motorbikes and estimated unit cost.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Yes.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

The PIF indicates 9 sources of co-financing totaling \$19,897,000. Of these, only one (UNDP grant for \$100,000) are included in the CEO Endorsement. The PIF indicates 9 sources of co-financing totaling \$19,897,000. Of these, only one (UNDP grant for \$100,000) are included in the CEO Endorsement. Please provide explanation of why this significant change has occurred. Kindly note the importance of the range of co-financing partners that was conveyed in the PIF.

Please indicate the type of co-financing for from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, as well as IITA.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

No. As indicated in response to question 9 above, please complete and annex the LDCF/SCCF Indicators Framework for CCA projects.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** N/A

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

More targeted information is required. While information is provided on the adaptation planning baseline, particularly with support from the GCF, more specific information is required to define the specific adaptation planning gap that is not already supported by the GCF or other resources and why this gap is crucial to be addressed to strengthen climate resilience. We understand there have been delays in implementation and UNDP has requested a no-cost extension of this GCF support, which has been granted to August 2020.

We understand GEF LDCF funds are requested for this project to focus at least partly in the provinces of South Kivu, North Kivu, and Maniema, which have not been a focus of the GCF NAP support. However, it is not sufficiently clear if what activities are supported by which projects at the national level, and how they build on each other.

Given the landscape of multiple adaptation planning efforts and sources of funds currently under implementation or recently completed in DRC, please provide a more targeted description of which adaptation planning oriented projects supported what activities at the national and provincial levels (and in which provinces), which are ongoing or completed, and what specific crucial gaps will be addressed by the new GEF funds. We suggest a simple table format could greatly simplify. This is important to ensure avoidance of duplication and to maximise synergies between different projects. At a minimum, please include in this analysis (i) the adaptation planning support from GCF; (ii) PANA-AFE; (iii) previous GEF funded PANA-ASA; (iv) support provided from China for 125 stations; and other relevant projects.

As just initial examples, the GCF supported activity 1.1.3 is to "Set up a national coordination mechanism for climate change adaptation planning"; while the request new GEF support output 1.1 is "A National Adaptation Planning (NAP) framework for the priority sectors of agriculture and rural development is set up". Given this is referring to national framework, we assume the focus of this GEF output will be beyond the 3 provinces. As further example both GCF supported output 2.2 and proposed GEF supported output 1.1 both refer to identification of climate change risks. Particularly given the GCF project is still ongoing, how will these efforts avoid duplication and ensure synergy? Moreover, the first paragraph of the proposed new GEF output 1.1 (under "Expected outcomes and components of the project") is unclear as to what has been already supported under the GCF-NAP project and what is proposed to be supported under this new GEF one. Please make clarifications and adjustments throughout, as needed.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Yes, the project includes a budgeted M&E Plan.

Please utilize the GEF Core Indicators Framework specifically for LDCF/SCCF Climate Change Adaptation Projects by attaching this document in the road map section of the portal. Kindly remove the other indicators from the portal that were included in the "Core Indicators" section of the submitted CEO Endorsement.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Partially. Please more explicitly include knowledge management activities throughout the project for sharing learning within the country and broader, as part of output 3.2 and/or other outputs.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

**GEFSEC**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Not yet. The proposed project is still required to demonstrate a clearer additional reasoning in relation to project and project underway in the country.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**STAP**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Please include any comments received from STAP, and corresponding responses to each, as part of Annex B. If no comments were received from STAP, please indicate this.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **GEF Council**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Not yet. With regards to Germany's first comment on risk of overlap, please further detail complementarity with GCF NAP support and other adaptation enabling funds, consistent with the GEFSEC comments regarding question 8 above.

With regards to Germany's 3rd comment on private sector, please consider feasibility of involving microfinance institutions who are active in DRC, particularly related to finance of businesses supported through output 2.4, and consistent with the GEFSEC comments regarding question 2 above.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **Convention Secretariat**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**JS GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Please include any comments received from Convention Secretariat, and corresponding responses to each, as part of Annex B. If no comments were received from Convention Secretariat, please indicate this.

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

**Recommendation**



**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**GEFSEC 9March2020:**

Not yet. Please respond to the comments above by the GEF Secretariat.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		