Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management Plus (FARM+) in Nigeria

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID	
11688	
Countries	
Nigeria	
Project Name	
Financing Agrochemical Reduction and Management Plus (FARM+) in Nigeria	
Agencies	
AfDB	
Date received by PM	
12/19/2025	
Review completed by PM	
5/21/2026	
Program Manager	
Jewel Batchasingh	
Focal Area	
Multi Focal Area	
Project Type	
FSP	

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes and the executing agency is Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development.

Please correct spelling errors in document: eg. **"Componen5" and in the budget table.**

GENERAL ADDITIONAL COMMENT MAY 24 2026

Please attach the project document as PUBLIC for selection. There are several versions but they are not classified correctly.

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. A comprehensive proofreading and quality assurance review was undertaken across the full project package, including the Project Document, Results Framework, budget tables, annexes, and supporting safeguard documents. Corrections were made to substantive spelling, grammatical, formatting, numbering, and typographical inconsistencies identified during the review process. Minor variations relating solely to UK and US English spelling conventions were not systematically amended, as doing so throughout the full documentation package would have required extensive manual revisions without materially affecting the technical quality or clarity of the submission.

Response to Comment from May 24 2026:

The Agency project document has now been uploaded and classified as ?Public? in the portal for selection, in line with the comment received.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The Rio markers are detailed below:

Rio Markers			
Climate Change Mitigation	Climate Change Adaptation	Biodiversity	Land Degradation
No Contribution 0	Significant Objective 1	Significant Objective 1	Significant Objective 1

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.
a) 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 outcomes?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?
c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Clarifying that : OYSADA farm settlements into the SAPZ model refers to The Oyo State Agribusiness Development Agency (OYSADA) is actively transforming traditional, underutilized farm settlements into high-productivity Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zones (SAPZ).

In Figure 1: Simplified Project Framework, should the global program also be included?

Yes the current situation is detailed.

1. No reference to the Global Program
2. No reference to GEBS

3. Not clear on stakeholders and if private sector will be seen as a stakeholder or financier.

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. The project narrative has been revised to clarify the institutional relationship between OYSADA and the SAPZ programme, as well as the direction of integration. The revised text now clarifies that the Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zone (SAPZ) is an existing AfDB and Federal Government-led programme already operational in Oyo State. FARM+ does not establish new SAPZs. Rather, the project leverages existing SAPZ infrastructure and value chain systems at Fasola and Ijaiye as anchor sites while progressively integrating the remaining OYSADA-managed farm settlements into the broader SAPZ operational framework. The revised narrative also clarifies that OYSADA serves as a state-level coordinating and implementing institution supporting integration across the nine farm settlements, rather than being the originator or owner of the SAPZ model itself. This clarification strengthens the description of baseline investments, institutional roles, and project scalability.

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
c) 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?
d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The project objective is clear.

PMC is less than 5% and could be increased to ensure that there are funds for PMC for the project duration.

Resources allocated to M&E represent 3.3% of the subtotal - for projects between $5 and $10 million, the recommended threshold is 3%: please revise. Also, M&E outcomes and outputs are missed in the Child Project Description Overview table - please amend.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)					
M&E	Technical Assistance		GET	240,000.00	2,000,000.00
			Sub Total ($)	**7,180,000.00**	**245,000,000.00**
Project Management Cost (PMC)					
			GET	320,000.00	5,000,000.00
			Sub Total($)	**320,000.00**	**5,000,000.00**
			Total Project Cost($)	**7,500,000.00**	**250,000,000.00**

Components are clear.

On Component 5 - is 150,000 sufficient to execute the activities detailed?

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The PMC allocation has been revised to 4.75%, remaining below the 5% threshold applicable to Full-Sized Projects.
The resources allocated to Monitoring and Evaluation have been revised to 2.93% of the project subtotal, in line with the recommended threshold for projects within the USD 5 million to USD 10 million range. The budget allocation for Component 5 has been increased to USD 300,000 to adequately support knowledge management, communication, dissemination, programme coordination, and learning activities across the project lifecycle.

4. Project Outline

A. Project 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 project design?
b) Have 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 project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes . The scope of the project as in which crops it will address is not explicit It is assumed it will focus on the one westerly region. Can the crops to be covered be clarified?

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. The project is not necessarily limited to a single western region. However, it is anchored in Oyo State in Southwest Nigeria as the primary implementation area, with the Fasola Farm Settlement serving as the flagship site. The project will further expand to eight additional farm settlements within Oyo State, while maintaining strong potential for replication and scale-up at the national level.

Oyo State was strategically selected because it hosts one of the most advanced implementation frameworks under the Nigeria Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zones (SAPZ) Programme, including ongoing investments and institutional arrangements under SAPZ Phase I. The state already benefits from significant progress in infrastructure preparation, agro-industrial planning, and private sector engagement under the SAPZ initiative, making it an ideal demonstration platform for the FARM+ intervention.

The FARM+ project is therefore designed not only as a standalone intervention in Oyo State, but also as a catalytic pilot and demonstration model that can generate lessons, approaches, and scalable financing mechanisms for replication across the wider SAPZ programme in Nigeria. The Nigeria SAPZ Programme itself is being implemented as a national multi-tranche facility covering numerous participating states across the country, with phased expansion to additional states over time.

The SAPZ Programme seeks to improve agricultural productivity, agro-industrialization, value addition, climate-smart agriculture, and rural employment creation, particularly for women and youth. It is designed to mobilize large-scale public and private investment into agro-processing infrastructure, agricultural transformation centres, logistics systems, and value chain development.

Importantly, the SAPZ Phase II programme was designed specifically as a scalable national platform capable of expanding across multiple tranches and states, with implementation currently planned across up to 27 Nigerian states. The programme is structured to create demonstration effects in early implementation states, thereby reducing risks and attracting additional investments and replication in subsequent states and tranches.

Within this framework, FARM+ is expected to generate practical models and lessons on sustainable agrochemical reduction, integrated pest management (IPM), bio-pesticides, post-harvest loss reduction, climate-smart agriculture, and sustainable value chain development that can subsequently be integrated into additional SAPZ states and agro-industrial hubs nationwide. This creates a strong pathway for scaling the environmental and agricultural transformation impacts of FARM+ well beyond Oyo State.

Further clarification on the targeted crops has also been incorporated based on the proposed intervention pathways outlined in the project document. In this regard, a single consolidated ?Table 2: Priority Crops for the FARM+ Project? was developed under a new section entitled ?Consolidated Priority Crops for the FARM+ Project? within the component and output descriptions.

The table explicitly maps each targeted crop to the corresponding intervention pathways and activities, thereby clearly demonstrating how each crop aligns with the overall project design and implementation strategy. A two-tier crop selection system was adopted, comprising six core crops, namely cassava, yam, maize, soybean, vegetables (including tomatoes), and cocoa, alongside two additional pilot crops, sesame and ginger, which were selected for phased piloting and export-oriented organic market development.

The selected crops are linked to three major intervention pathways, namely: (i) post-harvest infrastructure and loss prevention, (ii) organic agriculture policy and market development, and (iii) integrated pest management (IPM) and bio-pesticide demonstration. This consolidated framework strengthens the coherence between crop selection, project components, and expected outcomes, while also reinforcing the project?s scalability and replication potential across Nigeria.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

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

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

The project is part of the FARM program and will continue to provide investment in the agricultural sector.

Agency Response

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).
d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please indicate in the organogram the role of the agency and global Farm program.

The International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) is presented as to serve as the GEF Implementing Agency and Fund Manager. Should the IIAT be considered to play an executing function, it must also be included in the Child Project General information table and reflected in the budget table.

Section 'Cooperation with ongoing initiatives ... ' is empty - please complete

Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this child project?

If so, please describe that role here and the justification.

Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

ADDITIONAL COMMENT MAY 15 2026

Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects

From a strategic positioning perspective, FARM+ Nigeria is deliberately designed as a catalytic layer within Nigeria's existing agricultural investment ecosystem and not as a standalone intervention. By anchoring activities within infrastructure, networks, and platforms already operational across Oyo State and beyond, the project adds the targeted dimensions of HHP elimination, biodiversity protection, and climate adaptation that current programmes lack, while avoiding duplication of effort or parallel institutional structures.

a) Global GEF Architecture and Continental Alignment

FARM+ Nigeria is a child project within the GEF-8 global FARM+ programme, with the AfDB as global Lead Agency and IITA as GEF Implementing Agency, ensuring strategic coherence across participating countries and with the continental SAPZ portfolio. At the global level, the project contributes to the Kunming-Montreal Biodiversity Framework, the Stockholm Convention, and SAICM, with Nigeria's regulatory reforms and HHP reduction pathway feeding into international reporting. The Federal Ministry of Environment manages Nigeria's interface with the global FARM knowledge platform, enabling South-South learning and positioning Nigeria as a replication model for other African contexts.

b) Flagship Programme Partnerships

Five operational programmes provide the primary co-location and integration opportunities:

Partner	Programme Scope	FARM+ Integration

Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this child project?

If so, please describe that role here and the justification.

Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing (max. 500 words, approximately 1 page)

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment.

1. The organogram has been revised to clearly reflect the roles and relationships of the GEF Agency, the Global FARM+ Programme, and the key national implementation partners within the project structure. Additional clarification has also been provided on the specific responsibilities of the Federal Ministry of Environment (FMoE), Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (FMAFS), OYSADA, ACOSS, IITA, and other implementing stakeholders. A dedicated stakeholder roles and responsibilities table has furthermore been added to strengthen clarity on

institutional coordination and implementation arrangements. NAIC has also been added as a member of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) following additional stakeholder consultations.

2. Further clarification has been incorporated into the revised organogram and institutional narrative regarding IITA?s role in the project. IITA is not serving as a GEF Implementing Agency or Fund Manager under the FARM+ child project. Rather, IITA is serving as an executing and technical implementation partner, drawing on its existing role and experience as an executing entity under the AfDB-financed Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zones (SAPZ) Programme in Nigeria. In this capacity, IITA will support day-to-day operational and technical delivery, including implementation support, technical coordination, climate-smart agriculture interventions, post-harvest management activities, agro-processing support, capacity building, and knowledge generation.

3. The reference to IITA as ?Fund Manager? has therefore been corrected throughout the document. Fiduciary oversight and GEF fund management responsibilities remain with the African Development Bank (AfDB) as the GEF Implementing Agency. IITA?s participation in the Project Management Unit (PMU), including associated staffing and technical support functions, is financed through the project co-financing arrangements linked to the SAPZ Programme and related baseline initiatives.

4. A dedicated cooperation and coordination narrative has also been developed and integrated into the ProDoc, drawing on the project?s institutional arrangements, programme landscape analysis, and existing partnerships involving IITA, ILRI, SAPZ, and other national stakeholders. The revised section now identifies and elaborates concrete coordination mechanisms with several ongoing programmes and initiatives, including the AfDB-financed SAPZ Programme, IITA?s Business Incubation Platform, the IFAD Value Chain Development Programme, and the Nigeria Postharvest Systems Transformation Programme.

5. The revised narrative further explains opportunities for co-location, shared infrastructure, technical collaboration, joint staffing support, farmer outreach, knowledge exchange, and market linkages across the project?s five components. Additional coordination arrangements have also been described with relevant government ministries and agencies, women and youth farmer groups, commodity and marketing associations, financial institutions, and CropLife Nigeria, particularly in relation to sustainable agrochemical management, integrated pest management (IPM), and private sector engagement.

6. Further clarification has additionally been provided regarding the strategic linkage between FARM+ and the national SAPZ Programme in Nigeria. Oyo State was selected as the primary implementation area because it hosts one of the most advanced SAPZ implementation frameworks in the country, including operational agro-industrial investments, institutional coordination mechanisms, and established implementation structures. FARM+ will initially focus on the Fasola Farm Settlement and subsequently expand to eight additional farm settlements within Oyo State. The project is designed as a catalytic demonstration model whose lessons, approaches, and results can subsequently be scaled up across additional SAPZ states and agro-industrial hubs participating in the wider national SAPZ Programme in Nigeria.

Response on 19 May 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The section on "coordination with ongoing initiatives and projects" has been moved to the correct section.

5.3 Core indicators
a) 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)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program? b) Are the project?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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes.

Under C.I. 6.1, please include the anticipated start year of accounting at CEO endorsement.

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The anticipated start year of accounting under Core Indicator C.I. 6.1 has now been included in the revised CEO Endorsement document. Accounting is expected to commence in Year 3 of project implementation, following the completion of the initial establishment, capacity-building, and systems operationalization phases required to enable effective monitoring and reporting against the indicator methodology.

5.4 Risks
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, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?
b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes the project aligns with the GEF 8 programming directions

Agency Response
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 comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes the project is part of FARM program which is part of the programming for chemicals and wastes.

Agency Response

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

It is referenced in the project summary as follows: This FARM+ project solution framework addresses local and national environmental concerns by piloting and validating globally replicable pathways in climate-resilient agriculture. The transdisciplinary design is also aligned with targets 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 23 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

Please expand on how the project contributes to these targets.

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. A target-by-target narrative has been developed and integrated into the ProDoc, drawing on the project's documented activities, indicators, and intervention logic across all five components. This forms part of ?Section G OTHER REQUIREMENTS? under subsection ?Socio-economic Benefits?. Each target is addressed with specific reference to the relevant component, output, or quantified indicator rather than through generic statements of alignment, ensuring that biodiversity-focused reviewers and GEF focal points can trace the project's contribution to each target directly from the project document presentations.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. Please note that there are tracked changes within the body of the document.

Are the Yoruba persons integrated into the project save the translation of materials?

•As per GEF guidance, please ensure that gender considerations and the activities identified in the Gender Action Plan are fully integrated into the project components, outcomes, outputs, and Results Framework, rather than presented as a stand alone section. As good practice, the GAP should be explicitly linked to project components and outputs (e.g., through a mapping table).

•FARM+ identifies gender as a cross cutting priority across policies, investments, training, capacity building, employment, and knowledge management. Child projects are therefore requested to coordinate with the FARM+ Gender Specialist to ensure coherence and harmonization of gender actions across the program and projects. We encourage the Agency to seek guidance to the GCP.

•Under M&E, please ensure that gender related results, lessons learned, and GAP implementation are regularly monitored and reported on (including in MTRs and TEs).

•Finally, please ensure that the Results Framework includes gender specific indicators, as outlined in the Gender Section.

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment.

1. The tracked changes and editing marks within the Gender Action Plan (GAP) document have been removed and a clean final version has been uploaded as part of the revised submission package.

2. Yes. The narrative has been revised to clarify that Yoruba persons are substantively integrated into the project as part of the broader local communities within the project implementation area, well beyond the translation of project materials. Their participation is embedded throughout the project?s design, governance structures, implementation arrangements, capacity-building activities, and beneficiary engagement processes across Oyo State.

As part of the local communities, Yoruba stakeholders are integrated as primary beneficiaries, farmer cooperatives, women and youth entrepreneurs, local governance actors, extension users, academic and research partners, and participants in sustainable agriculture and value chain activities. The project implementation architecture itself, including OYSADA coordination structures, farm settlement cooperatives, local universities, research farms, and community networks, is grounded within existing local institutional and leadership systems in Oyo State. Clarifications have also been incorporated into the Stakeholder Engagement section of the document, including under the ?Project Affected Parties? narrative.

3. Gender considerations and GAP activities have now been fully mainstreamed across the project components, outcomes, outputs, implementation arrangements, Monitoring and Evaluation framework, and Results Framework, rather than being treated as a standalone section. The previous standalone section on ?Gendering the FARM+ Project for Women?s Empowerment? was revised and integrated directly into the relevant technical and implementation sections of the Project Document.

In addition, a dedicated GAP Mapping Table (Table 12, Annex C) has been developed covering all five project components. The table explicitly links each GAP activity to the corresponding project component, outcome, output, quantitative gender indicator, target, and responsible implementing institution.

The revised framework therefore:

•Anchors each GAP activity to specific project outputs and implementation activities;
•Includes measurable and quantified gender indicators and targets;
•Assigns clear institutional responsibilities and accountability mechanisms; and
•Integrates gender considerations across policy reform, finance, technical assistance, Farmer Field Schools, supply chains, governance structures, employment, and knowledge dissemination activities.

Key gender targets, including women?s participation in governance structures, women?s access to finance and training opportunities, and gender-disaggregated M&E reporting, have also been aligned with the FARM+ Global Child Programme (GCP) framework.

4. The FARM+ Global Child Programme (GCP) Gender Specialist and programme-level gender framework were consulted and incorporated throughout the preparation and revision of the Nigeria child project. The project?s Gender Action Plan, gender analysis, indicators, targets, and GAP Mapping Table were developed in alignment with the programme-wide FARM+ gender framework to ensure consistency and harmonisation across participating countries and child projects.

Ongoing coordination with the GCP and the FARM+ Gender Specialist has also been integrated into the implementation arrangements, including through programme-wide reporting, coordination forums, and harmonised gender-disaggregated monitoring and knowledge-sharing mechanisms under Component 5.

5. Gender-related results, GAP implementation, lessons learned, and gender-responsive monitoring requirements have now been explicitly integrated into the Monitoring and Evaluation framework. Dedicated gender-disaggregated indicators, reporting requirements, and tracking mechanisms have been incorporated into quarterly reporting, annual reporting, Mid-Term Reviews (MTRs), and Terminal Evaluations (TEs).

Further clarification has also been incorporated into the M&E section of the Project Document and within the GAP Matrix to identify the responsible institutions, reporting pathways, and tracking arrangements for gender-related activities and results throughout project implementation.

6. It is confirmed that gender-sensitive indicators have now been fully integrated into the Results Framework across all five project components at output, outcome, and impact levels. These indicators cover women?s participation in Farmer Field Schools, access to finance, adoption of climate-smart agriculture practices, participation in governance structures, sustainable agrochemical management, market participation, and livelihood opportunities.

All relevant indicators are sex- and age-disaggregated, with indicator definitions, methodologies, and reporting cycles aligned with the FARM+ Global Child Programme framework to ensure consistency and contribution to programme-wide gender impact reporting. The GAP Mapping Table additionally serves as the operational reference linking each gender-sensitive indicator to the relevant component, output, responsible institution, and quantitative target throughout the project lifecycle.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

We note that the agency attached the ESMP, Gender Action Plan, and Stakeholder Engagement Plan. An overall ESS risk is classified as Low.

The project area, Oyo State, is historically and predominantly Yoruba, and the Oyo (a Yoruba subgroup) are indigenous to this area. We appreciate the efforts to engage with Indigenous Peoples and integrate traditional and local knowledge of Indigenous Peoples into the project design.

- Please include Indigenous Peoples communities as a part of stakeholders in the stakeholder engagement plan and recognize them as partners of the project governance.
- Please also include Indigenous Peoples as primary target of beneficiaries in addition to ?disadvantage smallholder farmers, women, and youth? (CEO Endorsement, page 4).
- Please clarify whether the project ensures FPIC about the project design (particularly project governance mechanisms, integration of traditional and local knowledge, and priority of activities in Component 3 and 4) by Indigenous Peoples during PPG.
- Please clarify how the results of the consultations with Indigenous Peoples were integrated into the project during the PPG.
- Please also clarify how the project was conducted with small farmers (including women and youth) and CSOs during PPG and how the results of consultations were integrated into the project design.
- Please consider integrating Indigenous Peoples governance, traditional and local knowledge, and security of tenures in the project, particularly in Component 3 and 4.

- Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to respect Indigenous Peoples? 1) governance mechanisms, 2) traditional and local knowledge, and 3) security of tenures and socioeconomic benefits on Indigenous Peoples in the project.

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The revised project documentation clarifies that the Yoruba people in Oyo State are recognised as the predominant local ethnic community and traditional sociocultural group within the project area. In the Nigerian and broader African context, references to tribes or ethnic groups generally relate to historically rooted linguistic, cultural, and community identities forming part of the mainstream population structure within a state or region.

While the Yoruba people are indigenous to Oyo State in the ordinary historical and cultural sense, they are not classified as ?Indigenous Peoples? under the specific meaning typically applied within international safeguard frameworks, including GEF and AfDB environmental and social safeguard policies, which generally refer to distinct, vulnerable, marginalized, and non-dominant groups requiring specific protections under such frameworks.

Nevertheless, the project fully recognises Yoruba local communities as core stakeholders, primary beneficiaries, and strategic implementation partners throughout the project lifecycle. Local communities have therefore been explicitly integrated into the stakeholder mapping, governance arrangements, consultation processes, implementation structures, and beneficiary descriptions across the revised project package, including within the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and CEO Endorsement document.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
ADDITIONAL COMMENT MAY 24 2026

•Status of Utilization of PPG: previously it was requested to utilize the **eligible categories**, which WAS NOT PROVIDED. An additional comment was a question to the Agency on paying personnel with GEF resources, which is not allowed. No explanation on whether the Agency paid (or not) personnel with GEF resources, in which case, they need to return the funds ($13,645) already spent.

Instead of explaining, it was observed that the Agency simply changed the line for activities that in principle, are not eligible. For instance, '*preparation of terms of reference*' is one activity that is covered by the Agency fee. It is unclear how or why in the previous version the activities were 'project preparation, appraisal, implementation arrangements support', and now 'procurement planning' is the only remaining task. The Agency needs to present a detailed explanation on the above. Please see below.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

global environment facility gef
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount ($)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Literature review, desktop assessments and fact-finding discussions for project design	61,225.00	61,225.00	0.00
Stakeholder consultations and stakeholder analysis	40,000.00	40,000.00	0.00
Gender Action Plan and environmental & social assessments	42,735.00	42,735.00	0.00
Procurement planning, basic costing and preparation of terms of reference	56,040.00	13,635.00	42,405.00
Total	200,000.00	**157,595.00**	**42,405.00**

ADDITIONAL COMMENT MAY 20 2026

Status of utilization of PPG still has categories that are not valid - for instance, PPG resources cannot pay the Agency's personnel - if there was a payment to the Agency, these funds must be returned to the Trustee. Please ask the Agency to revise the eligible PPG categories in Guidelines and use them.

Not completed. Please address.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT MAY 15 2026

Please list the activities implemented during the PPG phase rather than listing broad categories to better assess the validity of each. These items are not eligible without additional details to be validated: ?Implementation support?.

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. The Annex on the Status of Utilization of the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) has now been completed and updated in accordance with the applicable GEF guidelines and reporting requirements.

Response on 19 May 2026:

Thank you for the comment. The current level of itemization reflects the structure of the consultancy contract used during the PPG phase and the nature of the project preparation activities undertaken. To provide additional clarity, the wording of the activities presented in the PPG utilization table has been refined to more clearly describe the specific preparation activities supported during the PPG phase.

The baseline studies comprised literature reviews, desktop assessments, and fact-finding discussions undertaken to inform project design and preparation.

A consulting firm supported the overall PPG process under a single consultancy contract. Consequently, certain activities, including the Stakeholder Analysis, Gender Action Plan (GAP), and Environmental and Social (E&S) assessments, were not separately itemized in the consultancy contract budget and therefore cannot be further financially disaggregated.

The item previously referred to as ?Implementation Support? has also been clarified to reflect AfDB technical and operational preparation activities required to ensure compliance with AfDB policies and GEF requirements, including preparation and approval of the Project Appraisal Report (PAR), project feasibility assessment, development of the detailed procurement plan, and establishment of implementation arrangements.

AfDB Response on 21 May 2026:

Thank you, the status of utilization of PPG resources has been revised in alignment with eligible PPG categories in GEF guidelines.

AfDB Response to Comment from May 20 2026 and complementary information (24 May 2026):
Thank you for your comment. We have revised the activity descriptions in Annex D: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) to align more closely with the eligible expenditure categories outlined in the ?Guidelines on the Use of PPG Resources (2025)?. In response to the comments received, the revised table now:

•itemizes the specific project preparation activities implemented during the PPG phase rather than using broad expenditure categories;
•clarifies the preparatory and technical nature of the activities financed under the PPG;
•removes wording that could imply project implementation support or regular Agency operational activities; and
•specifies the scope of activities related to procurement planning, costing exercises, implementation arrangements and preparation of Terms of Reference.

The revised activity descriptions now more clearly reflect eligible PPG activities including:

•literature review, desktop assessments and technical analyses;
•stakeholder consultations and validation activities;
•gender analysis and environmental and social safeguard assessments;
•climate risk assessment and supporting technical studies;
•development of implementation arrangements and financing mechanisms;
•preparation of Terms of Reference for the Project Management Unit (PMU), Executing Agencies and technical studies; and
•drafting and finalization of the CEO Endorsement Request package and AfDB Project Appraisal Report (PAR) / Addendum.

In addition, we have attached a supplementary one-page explanation (Annex R) providing further details on the activities undertaken during the PPG phase and their alignment with the eligible expenditure categories under the Guidelines.

At the African Development Bank, the preparation of GEF CEO Endorsement packages and associated AfDB PAR documentation is undertaken through outsourced consulting firms financed under approved PPG resources. In this case, all activities reflected in the PPG table were undertaken by the contracted Consulting Firm in support of the technical preparation of the FARM+ Nigeria child project documentation.

No PPG resources were used for AfDB internal staff time, regular Agency operational activities, salaries, internal Bank review or approval processes, or project implementation activities. AfDB did not pay itself using PPG resources. All expenditures financed under the PPG were exclusively related to eligible project preparation activities in accordance with the approved PPG objectives and GEF PPG Guidelines.

8.3 Source of Funds
Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?
Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestThe letter from OFP is attached.

Agency Response
8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?
e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**The cofinancing letter from AfDB is not attached.**

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The co-financing letter has now been attached.
Annex B: Endorsements
8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request
AfDB letter not attached.

There is no additional cofinancing from other entities. Please clarify that stakeholders were engaged to garner cofinancing?

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The AfDB co-financing letter has now been attached. In addition, it is clarified that all confirmed co-financing associated with the FARM+ Nigeria child project is derived from the AfDB-supported Nigeria Special Agro-Industrial Processing Zones (SAPZ) Programme, which serves as the project?s baseline investment platform and principal co-financing source. The FARM+ intervention has been designed as a complementary and catalytic initiative integrated into the broader SAPZ investment framework, including SAPZ Phase II and its associated agro-industrial infrastructure, agricultural productivity, climate-smart agriculture, youth and women empowerment, and value chain development investments. As such, no additional stakeholders were engaged specifically for the purpose of mobilizing co-financing under the FARM+ project, as the co-financing arrangements are already embedded within the broader SAPZ programme structure and financing framework.
b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNo. AfDB letter missing.

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The AfDB co-financing letter has now been attached.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNeeds to be clarified.

Agency ResponseThank you for the comment. The AfDB co-financing letter has now been attached.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Please enter in Annex E, the geo-referenced information (latitude and longitude) in their respective fields where the project interventions will take place. They are currently in a table format under that section. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format (e.g., for Washington DC, Latitude 38.89511 and Longitude -77.03637) and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy.

ADDITIONAL COMMENT MAY 15 2026

1. *Under annex E, please enter the geo-referenced information (latitude and longitude) in their respective fields where the project interventions will take place.*

Agency Response

Thank you for the comment. This update was mistakenly not completed. The geo-referenced information for the project intervention areas has now been entered directly into the respective latitude and longitude fields in Annex E in Decimal Degrees WGS84 format, in line with the Secretariat?s guidance. Coordinates were converted and verified using the FCC DMS-to-Decimal conversion tool, and at least four decimal points were applied to ensure improved geographic accuracy and consistency throughout the annex.

Response on 19 May 2026:

Thank you for the comment. This update was mistakenly not completed. It has been corrected now.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1. The Agency must utilize the template included in Annex 7 of the Guidelines (accessible here) - please abide to the categories included in the template, presenting the costs per Component (not per outcome) and the subtotals.

2. There are several budget lines (see some examples below) classified as "Grants / sub-grants", but per the detailed description, they are activities that will be carried out by either companies or individuals in the form of consultancies (which is the category included in the GEF template) - please amend.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)																	Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity ftn1
		Component 1:Policy, Regulations and Enforcement		Component 2: Finance, Investment and Insurance				Component 3:Technical Assistance and Introduction of Alternatives					Component 4:Improving Food Supply Chains			Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Output 1.1 (40,000)	*Outcome 1.2*	*Outcome 2.1*	*Outcome 2.2*	*Outcome 2.3*	*Outcome 2.4*	*Outcome 3.1*	*Outcome 3.2*	*Outcome 3.3*	*Outcome 3.4*	*Outcome 3.5*	*Outcome 4.1*	*Outcome 4.2*	*Outcome 4.3*					

	Inventory & Safeguarding -Preparation & Repackaging	20,000	20,000										1,200			**41,200**			**41,200**	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Secure Transport & Legal Clearance - Transportation & Permits												1,000			**1,000**			**1,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Destruction (End-of-Life) -Final Disposal/Incineration Fee												10,000			**10,000**			**10,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Laboratory Analysis of OCPs, a broad pesticide screen, nutrients (nitrate ions, phosphates), and basic physio-chemical parameters (pH, EC).									15,000						**15,000**			**15,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Specialized sampling equipment, consumables (certified sterile bottles), preservation chemicals, vehicle rental, fuel and per diem/labor									5,000						**5,000**			**5,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment

3. Please list the Project Coordinator in one line/row with associated costs charged to component and PMC as appropriate. Same with the Project Administration Officer and Procurement Officer.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)																	Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity ftn1
		Component 1:Policy, Regulations and Enforcement		Component 2: Finance, Investment and Insurance				Component 3:Technical Assistance and Introduction of Alternatives					Component 4:Improving Food Supply Chains			*Sub-Total*	*M&E*	*PMC*		
		Output 1.1 (40,000)	*Outcome 1.2*	*Outcome 2.1*	*Outcome 2.2*	*Outcome 2.3*	*Outcome 2.4*	*Outcome 3.1*	*Outcome 3.2*	*Outcome 3.3*	*Outcome 3.4*	*Outcome 3.5*	*Outcome 4.1*	*Outcome 4.2*	*Outcome 4.3*					
6. Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Coordinator, Finance officer, Project Adminstration Officer and Procurement Officer															-		360,000	360,000	Federal Ministry of Environment

4. The activity "Development for training modules ...." can't be classified as "Training and Workshops" - instead, this is an activity that must be carried out by either an individual or a company. Please present it in Budget Table captures as a discrete contract to be awarded.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)																	Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity ftn1
		Component 1:Policy, Regulations and Enforcement		Component 2: Finance, Investment and Insurance				Component 3:Technical Assistance and Introduction of Alternatives					Component 4:Improving Food Supply Chains			Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Output 1.1 (40,000)	*Outcome 1.2*	*Outcome 2.1*	*Outcome 2.2*	*Outcome 2.3*	*Outcome 2.4*	*Outcome 3.1*	*Outcome 3.2*	*Outcome 3.3*	*Outcome 3.4*	*Outcome 3.5*	*Outcome 4.1*	*Outcome 4.2*	*Outcome 4.3*					
	Development of training modules - Curriculum for climate-smart agriculture and responsible investment	20,000	20,000		30,000		25,000	20,000	25,000		20,000		15,000	15,000	13,800	**203,800**			**203,800**	Federal Ministry of Environment

5. Is this budget sufficient for the packaging and disposal?

products																		
Inventory & Safeguarding -Preparation & Repackaging	20,000	20,000									1,200			**41,200**			**41,200**	Federal Ministry of Environment

Secure Transport & Legal Clearance - Transportation & Permits											1,000			**1,000**			**1,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
Destruction (End-of-Life) -Final Disposal/Incineration Fee											10,000			**10,000**			**10,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment

6. Please clarify if this is a post or if this is office supplies?

															-			-	
9. Office Supplies	Administrative and Operational costs	25,000	25,000												**50,000**			**50,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment

7. Please explain this budget line:

certification																		
Global Coordination & Knowledge Dissemination														150,000	**150,000**			**150,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment

8. Resources allocated to M&E represent 3.3% of the subtotal - for projects between $5 and $10 million, the recommended threshold is 3%: please revise. Also, M&E outcomes and outputs are missed in the Child Project Description Overview table - please amend.

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

M&E	Technical Assistance		GET	240,000.00	2,000,000.00
			Sub Total ($)	7,180,000.00	245,000,000.00

Project Management Cost (PMC)

	GET	320,000.00	5,000,000.00
	Sub Total($)	320,000.00	5,000,000.00
	Total Project Cost($)	7,500,000.00	250,000,000.00

9. TORs for project staff not included. When resubmitting, please ensure alignment of the posts to the ToRs.

10. Several spelling errors in the budget.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MAY 15 2026

1. Budget table:

1. The Agency must utilize the template included in Annex 7 of the Guidelines (accessible here) - please abide to the categories included in the template, presenting the costs per Component (not per outcome) and the subtotals per category instead of per component.

1. Goods	Equipment for pilot setting up and maintanance							60,000									**60,000**			**60,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Essential cold chain infrastructure components: Targeting essential investments in logistics and post harvet handling for highly performing value chains using green technologies								200,000			100,000	202,000		50,000		**552,000**			**552,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Laptops, printer and tonners																		10,000	**10,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment
2. Grants/Sub-grants	Agro-waste processing plants: Grant to support the SMEs to venture into using crop and livestock residues such as cassava peels and biodigester				200,000			80,000	200,000		80,000		102,000		150,000		**812,000**			**812,000**	Federal Ministry of Environment

2. The budget line ?Data, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist: Salaries? should be classified under consultancies, not under ?Other operating costs?.

10. Other Operating Costs	Monitoring and evaluation ; Baseline/midline/endline surveys,																-	#5,000		#5,000	Federal Ministry of Environment
	Data, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist: Salaries																	#4,000		#4,000	Federal Ministry of Environment

3. The TORs for the Project Administrator and Procurement Specialist indicate an estimated 50% overlap in responsibilities. Please remove the redundancies and retain only one of these positions.

PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR	**PROCUREMENT SPECIALIST**
Manage office operations, procurement processes, and logistical arrangements across project locations	Lead and manage all aspects of the procurement process, including drafting tender specifications, launching tenders, evaluating bids, and award recommendations in compliance with AfDB and EU procurement rules
Ensure full compliance with procurement and administrative policies in all operational activities	Collect and verify supporting documents for payments to suppliers, ensuring compliance with donor financial regulations
Support and manage the diary and day-to-day activities of the Project Coordinator	Undertake any other procurement or administrative assignments required for the efficient functioning of the PMU
Maintain comprehensive digital and physical filing systems, ensuring documentation is organised, accessible, and audit-ready	Manage the contracts portfolio, overseeing the full contracting process, encoding contracts in appropriate software, and maintaining a contracts schedule with regular follow-up

Agency Response

Thank you for the comments.

1. The budget presentation has been revised and reformatted using the template provided in Annex 7 of the Guidelines. Costs are now presented per component, including the required subtotals, in full alignment with the prescribed template structure and reporting requirements.

2. A careful review of all budget lines and items has been undertaken in response to this comment, and the budget has been adjusted accordingly, with budget lines previously misclassified correctly reclassified under the appropriate categories in alignment with the GEF template requirements.

3. The positions and respective costs have been listed as advised. The Terms of Reference for each position served as the guiding basis for determining and apportioning the respective cost allocations accordingly. The positions and respective costs have been listed as advised.

4. The activity has been reclassified and is now presented as a consultancy contract to be awarded to either an individual or a company, in accordance with the guidance provided.

5. The allocated budget has been reviewed and confirmed as adequate to cover all planned packaging and disposal activities.

6. The activity has been clarified as stationery and the associated amount has been adjusted accordingly to accurately reflect the nature of the expenditure.

7. The budget line has been clarified to reflect that it relates specifically to activities under Component 5, covering the design and dissemination of knowledge products generated through the project's monitoring, evaluation, and learning processes.

8. The resources allocated to Monitoring and Evaluation have been revised, bringing the allocation within the recommended 3% threshold applicable to projects in the USD 5 million to USD 10 million range.

9. As suggested, the Child Project Description Overview table has been amended to include the M&E outcome and outputs that were previously omitted.

An overarching outcome has been added reflecting the project's commitment to an adaptive, evidence-based monitoring system that generates timely, sex- and age-disaggregated data to guide project management and demonstrate impact across all five components.

Four outputs have been included covering the real-time digital M&E dashboard; the three-phase environmental sampling programme (baseline, mid-term, and terminal); mandatory reporting products in line with GEF Policy on Monitoring (ME/PL/03) and AfDB requirements; and the Gender Action Plan implementation tracker.

These additions ensure full consistency with the detailed M&E Framework set out in the project document. Specifically, the amended table now provides a complete and accurate summary of the child project's results architecture, ensuring that M&E outcomes and outputs are visible at the overview level and consistently reflected throughout the Child Project Description.

10. The ToRs for all project staff have been included in the resubmission, with the posts aligned to the respective ToRs and further guided by the modified organogram. This ensures consistency in role definition, reporting lines, and cost allocations across the project structure.

11. A thorough proofreading exercise has been conducted throughout the document to identify and correct all spelling and grammatical errors. This ensures that the resubmitted document meets the required standard of written clarity and accuracy.

Response on 19 May 2026:

Thank you for the comments received on the FARM+ Project budget. We wish to confirm that all suggestions have been duly incorporated. The correct template has been used as suggested. Budget lines have been moved to their appropriate categories as recommended.

Additionally, the project staffing structure has been revised to reflect updated project arrangements: the Project Administrator (Secretary) position has been replaced with an ESS Officer, and the Project Accountant position has been replaced with a Communications Officer, given that the SAPZ co-financing arrangement already provides a dedicated project accountant.

These changes have been effected in both the project budget and the CEO Endorsement document accordingly.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes
8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.
b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.
c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		5/12/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/20/2026	5/19/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/24/2026	5/21/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		5/27/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)		