



Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management Plus (FARM+)?

Edit and Submit PIF

Basic project information

GEF ID

11682

Countries

Global (Nigeria, Gambia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Nepal, Benin, Egypt, Ghana)

Project Name

Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management Plus (FARM+)?

Agencies

UNDP, AfDB, FAO, UNEP, UNIDO

Date received by PM

9/18/2024

Review completed by PM

10/24/2024

Program Manager

Anil Sookdeo

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

Please indicate the program commitment date.

Please include anticipated executing entity for each child projects entry if already identified in the LOEs.

October 21, 2024 - Comment cleared

Agency's CommentsThe program commitment date has been added. The executing agencies were also added to each child project entry.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

The program summary provides a clear and concise overview of the FARM+ program, addressing the key aspects of the problem, objectives, strategies, and expected outcomes. It also highlights the geographical scope, sectoral focus, and transformative elements of the program. Please however summarize the key GEB, Adaptation and Socioeconomic benefits expected from the program. Additionally, please:

- Program summary: Last para: Please add to the list of country strategies and action plans: consistency with respective basin management plans.

- Program summary: Alignment to the countries plans under the UNCCD including those related to Land Degradation Neutrality targets is missing from the last paragraph. This should be included

given the objective of the program also includes ?. protect, regenerate and improve productive landscapes and soil health and reduce soil and water pollution from harmful agrochemicals

- Program summary: A sentence or two on the added value of doing these interventions as a program may also be useful

October 21, 2024 - Comment Cleared

Agency's Comments

The following sentences have been added in the Program Summary: Changes are highlighted in red.

- The program expects to achieve significant Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) in supporting countries to transition to sustainable and climate resilient agriculture practices. Overall, the project expects to avoid 3,816,870 metric tonnes of CO2 emissions, environmentally safely dispose of 100,394 Mt of hazardous waste containing POPs and HHPs, avoid 53gTeq of U-POPs, restore 25,603 hectares of land and ecosystems under restoration, implement improved practices in 1,759,510 hectares of land and 40,000 hectares of marine habitats, and manage 120,000 hectares of land for climate resilience. FARM+ interventions will benefit 7,499,511 people, of which more than half are women.
- Consistency with respective basin management plans has been added.
- Alignment to the countries? plans under the UNCCD including those related to LDN targets has been added.
- Sentences on the added value of doing these interventions as a program have been added.

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat's Comments

Overall, the Indicative Program Overview presents a well-structured and comprehensive outline of the FARM+ program. The components and outcomes are aligned with the program's objectives and Theory of Change. The inclusion of gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E, along with appropriate funding, further strengthens the program's design. The PMC is within the acceptable limit, however, there seems to be an error with the decimal point on the PMC as it calculates to .53% and not 5.3% as stated in the narrative. Please clarify or adjust. PMC is not proportionate between GEF financing and co-financing, please adjust the PFD and its child projects? budget accordingly

Listing the program components twice to indicate the different sources of funds seems a little complex and repetitive. Given that the components are the same, perhaps it may be simpler to list the source of funds under each component.

Program overview table: Outcome 4: Better supply chain management leads to less waste, less plastics, less GHGs and demonstrates improved product traceability. Please consider adding ?less soil and water pollution? to read: Outcome 4: Better supply chain management leads to less waste, less soil and water pollution, less plastics, less GHGs and demonstrates improved product traceability?

October 21, 2024 - Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

- We have reentered the PMC and corrected it in the Justification box. Kindly let us know if the issue has been resolved.
- The PMC for some of the child projects has been adjusted accordingly.
- The GEF portal structures components by SoF so we understand it is not possible to avoid the multiple listing of program components. Please clarify.
- Water and soil pollution has been added to Outcome 4 throughout the document. Changes are highlighted in red.

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?

b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's CommentsThe program rationale effectively describes the current situation from a systems perspective and demonstrates how the program design addresses the identified challenges. It recognizes the importance of stakeholder engagement, including the private sector

and local actors, in achieving the program's objectives. The baseline situation and previous efforts are acknowledged, and the program design implicitly incorporates lessons learned. Overall, the program rationale provides a strong foundation for the FARM+ program, however, considering that some of the child projects are in west African countries, it would be useful to highlight region-specific current/projected climate change impacts on agriculture/livelihoods (for instance in table 1).

Considering that some of the child projects are in west African countries, it would be useful to highlight region-specific current/projected climate change impacts on agriculture/livelihoods (for instance in table 1).

The drivers of the problem although mentioned in the text, could be made more explicit and will help to assess if those within the scope of the project are being addressed. This should also be reflected in the ToC which currently only has the barriers. Are the terms being used interchangeably?

The role and risks to women is well outlined. It would be worth to also mention the risk to youth. Minors are often part of agricultural production including the application of pesticides and are especially vulnerable to toxic exposure given both their weight and less awareness and fewer means of protection.

October 21 - Comments addressed

Agency's Comments

- The following text has been added to Table 1. Changes are highlighted in red. ?In West Africa, potential lethal heat days under a 2C scenario are expected to increase to 100-250 days per year (vs 50-150 at a 1.6C scenario). This is in line with what the West African region has already begun to see in the form of longer heat days that have progressively been increasing between 1-9 days each decade. In terms of rainfall it is projected that overall precipitation rates will be reduced partly due to the late onset of the rainy season over the Western Sahel. This will particularly affect agricultural related livelihoods and their capacity to plan for climate change. These extended dry periods will be followed by concentrated heavy rainfall events, paradoxically increasing the potential for both flooding and drought and increasing the risk for soil erosion.?
- The drivers mentioned in the Program Rationale relate to the growth in the size of the agrochemical market. The barriers relate to the achievement of sustainable and climate resilient agricultural systems. This has been clarified in the PFD. Changes are highlighted in red.
- The role of youth has been added in the Program Rationale. Changes are highlighted in red.
- Thank you for these suggestions. These gender aspects will be elaborated during the PPG phase.

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

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

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

The program description provides a clear and comprehensive overview of the FARM+ program's theory of change, building on previous investments, justification of components and solutions, incremental cost reasoning, levers of transformation, stakeholder engagement, gender considerations, knowledge management, and policy coherence. It demonstrates a well-structured and thoughtful approach to promoting sustainable and climate-resilient agriculture.

Gender:

The program description explicitly addresses gender issues by highlighting the differentiated impacts of climate change and agricultural practices on women and men. It acknowledges the specific constraints faced by women in adopting sustainable agriculture and outlines measures to address these challenges. The program's focus on gender-disaggregated data collection and analysis further demonstrate its commitment to gender mainstreaming.

Please ensure that representatives of women and gender groups / gender experts are represented and meaningfully participate in consultations to assess policies, financial mechanisms (related to Outputs 1.1. and 2.1); that gender considerations are taken into account in assessing and ensuring access by women to value chains (Output 2.4), information systems (Output 3.2), technologies, equipment and supplies (Output 3.4). In Output 5.2, please ensure also that best practices and lessons learned in empowering women and promoting social inclusion are featured and widely disseminated. On linkages to existing knowledge platforms, the GEF Gender Partnership has a Community of Practices among gender teams of GEF IPs that could benefit from best practices on gender and social inclusion from this project. As the program indicated that 70% of its beneficiaries are women, please ensure that a robust set of indicators would capture this in the RF. In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please ensure that the activities are budgeted, and subsequently monitored and reported on. It is also noted that the program identified as Substantial risk the full engagement of stakeholders in the design phase and that this will be mitigated at the program and child project preparation phase.

Stakeholders:

Women: The program emphasizes gender equality and women's empowerment, ensuring their participation and addressing their specific needs.

Private Sector: The program seeks to engage the private sector in promoting sustainable sourcing and supply chain practices, leveraging their resources and expertise.

CSOs: The program aims to collaborate with civil society organizations to facilitate knowledge exchange and advocacy for sustainable agriculture.

Other Stakeholders: The program also recognizes the importance of engaging governments, financial institutions, farmers, and other relevant actors in the design and implementation process.

Levers of transformation:

Policy and regulatory reforms: Creating an enabling environment for sustainable agriculture.

Financial mechanisms and incentives: Redirecting financial flows and promoting investment in sustainable practices.

Capacity building and knowledge sharing: Empowering farmers and other stakeholders to adopt sustainable approaches.

Technology introduction and innovation: Promoting the use of climate-resilient and environmentally friendly technologies.

Multi-stakeholder collaboration: Fostering partnerships and collective action to drive systemic change.

Policy Coherence:

The program places a strong emphasis on supporting participating countries in improving, developing, and aligning policies, regulations, and subsidies to promote sustainable agriculture. It aims to achieve this through:

Policy and regulatory assessments: Identifying and addressing policy incoherence and harmful incentives.

Capacity building: Strengthening the capacity of policymakers to formulate and implement coherent policies.

Financial mechanisms: Designing financial instruments that incentivize sustainable practices and discourage harmful ones.

Multi-stakeholder consultations: Ensuring that policy reforms are informed by a wide range of perspectives and interests.

There are however some areas for improvement:

- It looks like all the placeholder language is present for eventual fleshing out of the adaptation elements., though more specificity on the adaptation actions to be undertaken would be good (and will certainly be needed by CEO endorsement of the child project). Given that the Gambia is the only country that will be accessing LDCF resources, it is strange that there is no discussion in the doc on what is proposed re climate resilience specifically for the Gambia.
- Policy coherence should also involve those stakeholders who are responsible for land management/land use planning to build synergies, manage tradeoffs and capitalize on opportunities which may already be happening in this space. Eg SOILCARE.
- A summary on the child projects selected and their importance for the program would be useful. Are there common challenges in specific regions or in terms of specific economic standings.
- Component 5- Could the program be linked to the ISLANDS platform as well.
- Global Child project- ?Maintain coordination and knowledge exchange with existing multistakeholder initiatives?? Consider adding the ?EAT Forum? among the multistakeholder platforms to maintain experience and knowledge exchange with: <https://eatforum.org/>
- many countries will be supported in meeting their LDN targets with this program.

October 28, 2024 - Please include / capture in the PFD, under Program Description, last paragraph, the following elements:

Ensure that representatives of women and gender groups / gender experts are represented and meaningfully participate in consultations to assess policies, financial mechanisms;

Gender considerations are taken into account in assessing and ensuring access by women to value chains, information systems, technologies, equipment and supplies;

Best practices and lessons learned in empowering women and promoting social inclusion are featured and widely disseminated

In the development of the Gender Action Plan, activities will be budgeted, and subsequently monitored and reported on.

Agency's Comments

- Text on climate resilience activities has been added in the Program Description. Changes are highlighted in red.
- Land management/land use planning has been added in the paragraph on Policy Coherence. Changes are highlighted in red.
- A table summarizing the child projects has been added. Changes are highlighted in red.
- ISLANDS has been added in Component 5 and in the section on the Global Coordination Project. Changes are highlighted in red.
- EAT Forum has been added in the section on the Global Coordination Project. Changes are highlighted in red.
- Text that countries will be supported in meeting their LDN targets has been added. Changes are highlighted in red.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's CommentsThe FARM+ program demonstrates strong coherence and consistency in its design and approach. It incorporates elements that ensure resilience and adaptive management, outlines a clear path towards transformative change, and selects appropriate child projects that align with the program's objectives. The financing appears adequate, and the program's emphasis on stakeholder engagement, gender mainstreaming, and knowledge management further strengthens its potential for success.

Agency's Comments

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).

Secretariat's Comments

Institutional Arrangements and Organogram:

The program outlines the institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, primarily at the global level. It describes the establishment of a dedicated FARM+ team within UNDP to oversee program implementation and coordinate with child project teams and other partners. The team's reporting structure and guidance from various UNDP hubs are also mentioned. However, the description of institutional arrangements at regional, national, and local levels is less detailed. While it mentions the involvement of implementing agencies and government ministries at the national level, a more explicit outline of the coordination mechanisms and decision-making processes at these levels would strengthen the program's governance structure. The document does not include a program-level organogram or diagram illustrating the roles, responsibilities, and decision-making processes, which could further enhance clarity and transparency in governance.

Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives:

The program provides a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives. It highlights the intention to collaborate closely with the FARM program, ensuring alignment and knowledge exchange, however some additional information on how this collaboration will be done will strengthen the proposal. It also mentions linkages with various Integrated Programs (IPs) such as the Food Systems IP, Circular Solutions to Plastics IP, and others, as well as UNDP-led initiatives like FACS and BioFin. Additionally, the program plans to coordinate with international counterparts like the UNFCCC, UNCCD, CBD, and other relevant conventions. This demonstrates a clear intention to leverage synergies and avoid duplication of efforts. The program also mentions potential co-location and sharing of expertise/staffing with the Green Growth Knowledge Partnership (GGKP), which manages the knowledge platform for the FARM program. Overall, the program demonstrates a strong commitment to coordination and cooperation, which is crucial for maximizing its impact and sustainability.

October 21, 2025 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments

A program-level organigram has been included in the PFD

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?

Secretariat's Comments

The FARM+ program demonstrates a strong focus on achieving global environmental benefits and adaptation benefits. The core indicators are calculated using appropriate methodologies, and the GEB targets appear reasonable and achievable. The ambition is well noted. The program also recognizes the importance of socioeconomic benefits and outlines a comprehensive M&E approach that supports adaptive management. Overall, the program's focus on results, monitoring, and reporting contributes to its potential for success and long-term impact.

October 21, 2024 - please address the following: LDCF meta-information: SIDS child does not seem to be covered under LDCF. If that is the case, please select 'false' under 'this project involves at least one SIDS'.

October 24, 2024 - Comment Cleared

Agency's CommentsIn the LDCF meta-information section, the option for "this project involves at least one SIDS" has been removed.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

The FARM+ program faces a range of risks that could potentially hinder the achievement of its objectives. These risks span various domains, including contextual factors like climate change and environmental/social concerns, innovation-related challenges such as policy incoherence and technological adoption, and execution-related risks such as capacity limitations and fiduciary concerns. The program has outlined mitigation measures for each risk category, focusing on promoting climate-resilient practices, conducting social and environmental safeguards screening, strengthening policy coherence, building capacity, and ensuring financial oversight. While these measures are realistic and actionable, the risk assessment could be further strengthened by incorporating market-related risks, quantifying risks and impacts, and analyzing interdependencies between different risk categories. Overall, the program demonstrates a proactive approach to risk management, which is crucial for its successful implementation and long-term impact.

Please however see the following areas for strengthening:

- Please mention explicitly the risks to groundwater from agriculture and for projects to monitor groundwater pollution from pesticides as well as groundwater levels and avoiding over abstraction.
- Specifically assure the safety of minors working in the agriculture sector (planting, harvesting and processing)
- Political and governance: please Ministries of Water Resources and Irrigation
- Financial and business models: please mention that not only access for small holder farmers is often hard for a variety of reasons, but often women and indigenous groups are entirely excluded (e.g. due to not able to show land rights, among others)

Key Risk: Under risk table, please describe how the Overall risk rating was identified.

October 21, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments

- A market-related risk has been added to the risk table.
- Thank you for this comment. However, groundwater pollution is a specific type of environmental safeguards risk, which will be analysed during the PPG phase. This specific risk and its significance may vary among the projects and will be determined during the PPG phase.
- Thank you for this comment. The engagement of minors is a category under the risk of labor and working conditions, which has been mentioned in the Safeguards risk description. This specific

risk and its significance may vary among the projects and will be determined during the PPG phase.

- The Ministries of Water Resources and Irrigation have been added to the political and governance risk.
- Women and indigenous groups have been added in the financial and business models risk.
- The overall risk rating was identified by applying the highest risk level of all the individual risks. This has been indicated in the risk table.

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

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

The FARM+ program exhibits a strong alignment with the relevant GEF focal areas, LDCF/SCCF strategy, and country/regional priorities. Its focus on reducing hazardous chemicals, promoting sustainable practices, enhancing water security, mitigating climate change, and supporting vulnerable countries positions it well to achieve its objectives and contribute to global environmental benefits, however the following needs to be strengthened:

Alignment with LDCF GEF-8 programming strategies: Highlight alignment with the LDCF priority areas; scaling up finance, strengthening innovation and private sector engagement and the whole-of-society approach.

Alignment to the LD Focal Areas and MEAs: Please include how the program is aligned with the LDFA objectives as well as the UNCCD Strategic Action Framework 2018-2030 including how many countries will be supported in meeting their LDN targets with this program.

October 21, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments Alignment with the LDCF and LD GEF8 strategies have been added in the section on alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies. Changes are highlighted in red.

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments The child project selection criteria in the FARM+ program is well-defined and transparent, promoting a fair and competitive selection process while ensuring that the chosen projects align with the program's objectives and priorities.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

The FARM+ program exhibits a high degree of alignment and coherence with country, regional, and global priorities, policies, strategies, and plans. It is designed to support the implementation of MEAs and contribute to sustainable development across relevant sectors.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments

The uploaded safeguards document is not loading. Please verify that the document is uploaded correctly.

October 21, 2024 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments The safeguards document has been uploaded again.

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments A program-level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included.

Agency's Comments

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

**a) 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):**

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) table has been included and is accurately filled out.

The total PPG amount requested is \$1,620,000, which aligns with the sum of the PPG amounts requested for each of the 10 child projects listed in the "Child Projects under the Program" table.

The total PPG agency fee is \$145,800, which is also consistent with the sum of the individual PPG agency fees for the child projects.

Both of these totals are accurately reflected in the "Project Preparation Grant (PPG)" table, confirming that the PPG table is correctly filled out and aligns with the child project information.

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments The total GEF Project Financing amount in the Indicative Focal Area Elements table is \$62,074,144, which matches the grand total in the Child Projects table.

Similarly, the total Co-financing amount in the Indicative Focal Area Elements table is \$626,741,692, again consistent with the grand total Co-financing in the Child Projects table.

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of

the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments The indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing appear adequate and reflective of the program's ambition. The substantial co-financing amount, the diversity of sources, and the focus on investment mobilized demonstrate a strong commitment to leveraging additional resources and achieving the program's transformative goals.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

The LoE is missing for Mauritius. Please upload. For Nigeria, please create the link to the uploaded LoE on the portal template.

Title of child project differs between LOEs and Portal's child project entries, please either obtain revised LOEs or correct child projects' title to match with LOE: Benin, Nigeria, Gambia

Nepal LOE was not signed by the current OFP as indicated in our GEF website. Please obtain a revised LOE signed by the current OFP as relevant.

October 21, 2024 - Please submit missing LoE's. Noted and cleared on Nepal. Please upload the email from Benin when resubmitting the project.

October 24, 2024 - Comment Cleared.

Agency's Comments

- We are in the process of obtaining the LoE for Mauritius.
- The Nigeria LoE has been uploaded again.
- The titles of the child projects for Benin, Nigeria and Gambia have been adjusted in the portal to match the LoEs.
- According to the GEF website, the current OFP for Nepal is Mr. Dhani Ram Sharma and he signed the LoE.
- We are in the process of obtaining the email for Benin.

October 23, 2024 - We were unable to secure the LoE for Mauritius, so it has been withdrawn from the FARM+ program. The email for Benin has been uploaded.

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments

Please upload the maps directly into the portal template.

October 21, 2024 - comment cleared.

Agency's Comments The maps have been uploaded again.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program 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.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments Please address gender comment under program description.

Agency's Comments

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/3/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/24/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		