



CAR Inclusive and Resilient Cities Project

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11676

Countries

Central African Republic

Project Name

CAR Inclusive and Resilient Cities Project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

9/17/2024

Review completed by PM

10/25/2024

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

30 Oct 2024:

Cleared

29 Oct 2024:

Please remove any highlighted text of the PIF form for the final version in portal. Thank you.

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Response to comments from 29 October 2024:

Noted. Highlights removed.

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

25 October 2024:

Cleared

21 October 2024:

Please note that the information requested is required in the PIF submission to the GEF. Please provide the requested relevant information in the PIF document.

23 September 2024:

Please provide more substantive information on the current and anticipated climate problem that this project will address. In doing so, please provide indication of a optimistic and pessimistic climate scenarios, preferably RCP 4.5 and 8.5 to 2050 or 30 years into the future, and consider specific impacts (e.g. erosion, infrastructure damage, mobility reduction) or current and anticipated climate hazards (e.g. flooding due to increased severity and intensity of rainfall). Two scenarios are important in recognition it is likely that CAR will be adapting to linkage hazards and their impacts within these extremes. Laying out the climate problem with greater specificity is important to directly focus the project solution with the current and anticipated extent of the climate problem.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Please see paragraph 6 in LDCF PCN document in which we added a few characteristics. A comprehensive climate risk assessment has been conducted and included CC scenario and further information could be added as needed. We can provide access to the report as needed. It is not public yet.

Response to comments on 21 October 2024:

Thank you. Information added to in the GEF Portal under project description and in section "B. Sectoral and Institutional Context" of the PCN.

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

21 October 2024:

Cleared

23 September 2024:

Yes.

However, the intermediate result of "temporary jobs provided" is not a climate adaptation result. Please revise.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

This indicator has been included in the parent project and serves to measure the socioeconomic impact of civil works. One of the sub-objectives of the project design is to foster LIPW like type of work. Please note that the TOC provided in the GEF Offline PCN is that of the Parent Project and has been amended to include GEF, but nothing has been removed from the original TOC. Link to the LDCF indicator "Number of beneficiaries with diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income" has been clarified and added in the project summary.

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

Secretariat's Comments

30 October 2024:

Cleared

29 October 2024:

Please ensure that under M&E (Monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge management), gender-specific lessons learned are captured, monitored and reported on.

21 October 2024:

We note the additional information provided on gender, and knowledge management.

However, please what is referred to as the "data sheet"? Kindly note that all key information for GEF finance, particularly responses to comments, need to be included in the GEF PIF document.

23 September 2024:

No. Please expand.

Agency's Comments

Thank you for highlighting this, the gender dimension has now been developed in the Datasheet.

The knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation has already been included in Component 3 and budgeted at US\$ 0.2 million (please see table included below paragraph 36) . Further information on KM and M&E have also been added to the Datasheet. More detailed information on KM and M&E, with the budget set aside for these activities, will be provided by the GEF CEO Endorsement stage.

Response to comments on 21 October 2024:

Thank you. this is referring to the PIF document

Response to comments on October 29, 2024:

Noted. minor edits to components table to reflect gender-specific lessons are captured

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

25 October 2024:

Cleared

21 October 2024:

(i) Comment (i) has not been addressed. Please see clarifying comment on this above.

(ii) As laid out in the GEF-8 Climate Change Strategy, engagement of civil society actors is a common and important and active dimension of projects supported by the LDCF, which a view to a "whole of society approach". For example, could a list of civil society organizations and/or intended to be involved in the project be provided? Also, Please clarify what is being referred to as the "project SEP" and where this information is provided in the PIF document and/or attachments.

(iii) The GEF-8 climate change adaptation strategy has an inclusive perspective on private sector, For example, micro, small and medium enterprises are considered within the scope of private sector. Are micro enterprises fully beyond the scope of this project. Further, smallholder farmers are also often considered private sector.

23 September 2024:

(i) Please note the comments above on expanding on the climate problem (current and anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards) and how the project interventions will address this.

(ii) Please expand on the consultation, engagement, and foreseen role of civil society organizations and community groups, as well as public and private actors focused on women, girls, and youth engagement.

(iii) Please include a description of private sector engagement.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) Well noted thank you.

(ii) Could you please specify what areas specifically are needed? Engagement is detailed and covered by the project SEP. Further, a Community Coordination Committee (in addition to canonical Steering and Technical Committees) has been created by Decree by the Ministry of Urban Planning to ensure the participation of local communities and vulnerable groups (women, indigenous, IDPs etc.) into the preparation and implementation of the parent project. We could expand on some of these aspects as needed. Thank you in advance for your guidance.

(iii) There is no private sector engagement (if defined as PCM/PCF/PCE) included in the Project. CAR's context is not conducive to the private sector's engagement at this stage. Please let us know if you were referring to a different kind of engagement.

Response to comments on 21 October 2024:

Thank you.

(i) the project's description has been updated in the GEF portal (PIF) as well as the PCN.

(ii) Included Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) in application package. Also, reference is made in PIF to this SEP. The project highly values the involvement of these groups in the project and will continue to engage with them. Specially, through citizen engagement processes involved in the urban planning (subcomponent 1.2 & 3).

(iii) Thank you. Although the project does not directly target MSMEs, they could receive economic benefits from improved climate resilient infrastructure (increase productivity, lower costs etc.). The only way MSMEs can be is through potential obtention of civil works contracts. However, this will depend on the eligibility of the enterprise (capacity, price etc.). Smallholder farmers are not targeted directly as this project focuses on climate resilient infrastructure for urban citizens. However, they can be engaged through capacity building and implementation of for example urban farming. However, feasibility studies will determine whether this form of NBS is applicable and where.

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

21 October 2024:

Cleared

23 September 2024:

Please address comments above.

Agency's Comments Thank you. Comments addressed above.

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

25 October 2024:

Cleared

21 October 2024:

(i) Cleared

(ii) Please note the comment above about micro enterprises considered within private sector, and consider if it is possible to include an anticipated estimate for this core indicator.

23 September 2024:

(i) The number of people trained seems low. Please consider increasing.

(ii) Please indicate the number of private sector enterprises to be engaged.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) Estimates have been calculated based on context and disaggregated by State (70), Municipality (30) (there are only 2 municipalities in the projects) and Community (400) categories. The latter on Communities may look low but it is linked to the number of priority areas in the project (13) in which local representants would be trained on risk integrated urban planning and management. Due to the specific expertise entailed in this type of training, it is meant for a limited number of people. We think they are appropriate due to CAR's context and specificity of the training. However, the team and the PIU will indeed aim to achieve greater results. In addition, broader communication and sensibilization will be given (but they are not counted as ?training?). We added the "Number of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses" as a new indicator.

(ii) As indicated above, the private sector is not engaged. Considering CAR's context, it is too early to explore any private sector options.

Response to comments on 21 October 2024:

Thank you.

(ii) As private sector engagement is limited, it will not be possible to provide an estimate for this indicator at this point. The project will work explore engagement of through capacity building.

Feasibility studies during project preparation will determine level of private sector engagement.

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

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

21 October 2024:

Cleared, thank you.

23 September 2024:

Please explain how this project is innovative, and how it will improve aligned of national policies with climate adaptation objectives.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

There are several innovative angles to this project. In relation to NBS there are two immediate innovations (please see below). We can revise depending on what you refer to here:

1. First, the project is rather innovative as it looks into both water and soil management for flood and erosion risks reduction in urban areas. This is relatively innovative as we typically focus on one or the other. Only recently, Bank teams in the region started to integrate both. It started in the Democratic Republic of Congo 2 years ago and was developed in parallel in CAR; teams in Burundi, the Republic of Congo and Gabon are now starting to develop similar approaches. GFDRR (and Gap Fund) played an important role as it/they supported all preliminary data collection and analytics ? from drone flights to collect high resolution imagery to soil sampling to inform USLE calculations for slope instability analysis, as well as providing capacity building to state and local stakeholders (ministries, municipalities, and local communities). This led to very accurate flood and erosion risks modelling and to initial guidance and preliminary solutions to combat flood and gully erosions in urban settings. Such analysis also casted a new light on our understanding of root causes for urban gullies erosion creation, as well as expansion dynamics and how we can better manage them. The project is becoming a pilot in that sense and from which the region and other countries globally can benefit.
2. The second aspect worth highlighting is that the project is pushing the envelope in terms of Nature-based Solutions (NBS), which are integrated in multiple ways in the project ? at various scales (watershed, city, and neighborhood levels) with the goal to reduce flooding and to prevent soil degradation. NBS are also integrated into engineering techniques (e.g., with the use of Krainer walls, NBS Gabions, living barriers, etc.). This is an important shift of how NBS are leveraged as they are typically itemized (e.g., urban park, urban agriculture, green rooftop, wetlands etc.) and combined to grey infrastructure, which we also do in the project, but they are not integrated into urban design and engineering solutions. The CAR project shows that not only NBS can be integrated or coupled with grey solutions, but that in some cases the grey solutions can be converted into NBS by using organic and living material. This also has important socioeconomic impacts as the project's design is more conducive of the use of local

material and fostering more labor-intensive type of civic works, thus providing work opportunities to the most vulnerable populations. Since techniques and material are local, they can also be replicated easily at a low cost and maintained more easily. This is particularly relevant in a FCV context, for it is very complicated to import material and labor and attract firms for the implementation of the civil works.

Alignment with National Objective are developed in paragraph 22.

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

21 October 2024:

Cleared.

23 September 2024:

Please expand on this aspect, including alignment with the NDC, National Adaptation Plan and/or planning process, and other national planning and strategies.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Alignment with NDC and NAP are developed at paragraph 22 of the PCN.

Further clarification was added on NDC, and details were also added on how the project aligns with strategic axes of the NAP

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

23 September 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

24 October 2024:

Cleared

21 October 2024:

Please see additional comment above on civil society.

23 September 2024:

Please see comments above on stakeholders, including civil society, gender oriented organizations, and private sector.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Well noted. We responded to this comment above.

Response to comments on 21 October 2024:

Thank you. Comment addressed in sections above.

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

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

23 September 2024:

PPG is not requested.

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

21 October 2024:

Cleared. However, please also note that co-financing for IDA/FCV countries is included in several projects supported by the GEF LDCF, including previous projects with CAR implemented by other GEF Agencies. Please also note that in kind support is considered within the GEF policy on co-finance. There may also be opportunities for further co-finance with bilateral donors.

23 September 2024:

Yes.

But please consider potential for co-financing from the national government; as well as from other sources including other donors.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Co-financing from the government will not be feasible; CAR is IDA/FCV, resources are very limited. However, technical teams from the government, notably from 4 ministries ? the Ministry of Economy (MEPCI), the Ministry of Urban Planning (MURFVH), the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Water and Forests ? have already designated focal points and may deploy additional experts to support project implementation. Co-financing from other sources might be potentially possible by the time of proposal endorsement by GEF CEO, the team will continue to explore co-financing opportunities.

Response to comments on 21 October 2024:

Thank you. This is well noted.

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

30 Oct 2024:

Cleared

29 Oct 2024:

a. the template utilized removed the footnote that conditions for the selection of the executing partner ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

b. The table in the LoE is missing the focal area source and the totals are not aligned in the table so the total GEF project financing is not in the right column and the same applies to the GEF Project financing Agency Fee.

When either submit an email confirmation from the OFP agreeing to the footnote condition, or acquiring a revised LOE with such footnote, please also enter the FA source (Climate Change) and correct the misalignment of the column totals.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Response to comments from 29 October 2024:

Noted. the email was shared with the and cleared by the GEF in June 2024. A copy of the exchange with the OFP has been now uploaded in the roadmap.

Please note on the selection of "climate change" as a focal area that the endorsement letter template does not allow for that option; it only has CC STAR or CC Set Aside, neither of which apply. This was also discussed with the policy team to indicate that a focal area selection is not needed for LDCF financing.

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

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments

30 October 2024:

Cleared. We note the OFP correspondence in the documents upload.

29 October 2024:

Please see the comments about about the LOE footnote and format.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Response to comments from 29 October 2024:

Noted. comments addressed above.

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

23 September 2024:

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

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

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

23 September 2024:

No. Please complete and add this directly in the PIF document in section C.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

ESRS and Climate Risk screening instruments have been prepared for the parent project which is already effective (October 7, 2024) and attached in the roadmap.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

21 October 2024:

Cleared

23 September 2024:

For the meta information, please add a % for infrastructure/other infrastructure; and consider a % for nature based management.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Meta information added accordingly.

Response to comments from 29 October 2024:

Noted. comments addressed above.

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

23 September 2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

23 September 2024:

No PPG is requested

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/23/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2024	