

Strengthening the adaptive capacity of communities by up-scaling integrated landscape management and restoration in south-west region of Central African Republic

Basic Information

GEF ID

10771

Countries

Central African Republic

Project Title

Strengthening the adaptive capacity of communities by up-scaling integrated landscape management and restoration in south-west region of Central African Republic

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 698102

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

DIE

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please see comments for question 2 below with regards to the components in table B and their need to ensure greater consistency of direct focus on climate change adaptation objectives.

The title of the project does not sufficiently reflect the project focus. For example, what is being referred by "up-scaling"? Also, given the stated focus on agriculture, please consider including reference to agriculture in the project objective.

Agency Response

Comments in question 2 have been addressed below.

Thank you for the question on the project title. Please, consider that upscaling refers to the promotion of a landscape/ecosystem-based approach as a key adaptation measure to enhance resilience of communities and ecosystems to climate change impact. Also consider that in the project objective we highlight the focus on both productive (agricultural) and forest landscapes. Therefore, the title has not been updated.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 22April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 21April2021:

The project title in the Portal is different the title in the LoE. We assume this is accidental. Please align. At this stage, we suggest using the title indicated in the LoE. If desired and subject to approval, the title in the LOE could be adjusted by submitting a new LOE during the PPG.

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 18April2021:

We note the response below that "modifications have been made particularly in table B". However, the only modifications we see are (1) slight reformulation of Output 1.1.1 to achieving "climate change adaptation integration"; and deletion of Output 2.1.3.; and reformulation of Output 3.1.3 to "Capacities of research institutions and extension services strengthened to provide up-to-date adaptive support to forest and farm producer groups/cooperatives.". Please clarify if there have been further modifications in Table B, in addition to these.

We note the Agency's response below, and certainly appreciate that landscape restoration can in multiple contexts are often (depending on the specific climate problem that is intended to be addressed; context of the adaptive capacity; etc.) an effective approach to adaptive to climate impacts. The December 2020 STAP Guidance Document on NbS articulates the extent to which LDCF and SCCF finance commonly supports nature based solutions as a cost effective approach to generating climate change adaptation and resilience results (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.59.STAP_.Inf_.06_Natured_Based_Solution_GEF.pdf). However, as commented on March 25th, several outcomes and outputs are not currently articulated as being focused directly on generating climate change results via ecosystem restoration (e.g. restoration of ecosystems for increased resilience of ecosystem services to address specific adaptation impacts, rather than ecosystem restoration being an objective in itself). While ecosystem restoration can be an effective means to achieving the goal of achieving climate adaptation results, (if/when it is designed to directly address the climate problem and adaptive capacity), ecosystem restoration is often (albeit to differing extents depending on different contexts and situations) an effective way to achieve CCA, rather than an objective in itself. As indicated in the comments on March 25th, and as also discussed in some depth on a recent conference call, several outcomes and outputs are articulated as if restoration is the intended outcome, rather than an effective approach to achieve the outcome of CCA. Please reformulate the set of Outcomes and Outputs to more consistently articulate the projects direct focus on achieving climate change adaptation outcomes prior to resubmission of the PIF.

The response in the review sheet to the comment on reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases is well noted. Please ensure this response is fully incorporated in the PIF.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please briefly explain the considerations used to select these regions and livelihood zones (#s 5, 10, 11) as the focus area of this project.

The focus of outcomes and outputs on climate adaptation and resilience are insufficiently direct and inconsistent. Given this project is

relevant descriptive text in the PIF to ensure direct and consistent focus of this project on maximizing climate change adaptation and

resilience impacts. To support the Agency in this regards, below are a few examples noting similar reformulation is also required for all Components, Outcomes, and Outputs.

- Component 1: Please clarify the relevance of integrated and inclusive land-use planning and governance for achieving "climate adaptation" and enhanced climate resilience impacts;

- Outcome 1.1: Is efficient territorial planning proposed to achieve "resilient and sustainable integrated landscape management"? Or, is sustainable integrated landscape management a strategy to achieve climate adaptation and resilience? Please clarify this fundamental design aspect. The use of "and" here and in other outcomes and outputs is problematic, as it suggests the relationship with climate change adaptation and resilience is somewhat indirect and parallel, as opposed to one being a result of the other. These sort of indirect correlations to achieving climate and adaptation impacts need to be addressed throughout the document please.

- Output 1.1.1: Again, landscape restoration in development planning process seems to be articulated as an outcome in its own right, alongside climate change adaptation. Please clarify and focus landscape restoration as a cost-effective way to achieve climate change adaptation and restoration. Please consider if this improved focus on climate adaptation and resilience requires corresponding edits in other sections and the budget.

- Output 1.1.2: Here, it is not clear if community structures are being "strengthened/established" to promote integrated landscape management, whether or not that is a (cost) effective approach to strengthening climate change adaptation and resilience. If this and other outputs are not considered and articulated as a direct and cost effective approach to strengthening climate adaptation, please delete and make corresponding modification tot he budget. Moreover, please clarify if community structures be strengthened or established or both.

- Output 1.1.3: Here, it seems intersectoral platforms are to be set up "at all relevant scales to promote coordination amongst all relevant stakeholders for efficient landscape planning", with M&E of adaptation as a different result. Moreover, please improve clarity and specificity regarding what is meant by "all relevant stakeholders" by briefly indicating what is actually being referred to.

- With regards to Component 2, please strengthen explanation of why "natural resources management mechanisms and restoration of degraded landscapes" are an effective way to address impacts of current and anticipated climate hazards for populations in the specified project areas, and make any adjustments to the outputs and budget.

- With regards to Component 3, please strengthen articulation and initial comparative analysis of the cost-effectiveness of the suite of ecosystem based approaches proposed in this component, and revise accordingly if some of the approaches are anticipated to have relatively low cost effectiveness for climate adaptation impact. Additionally, please consider potential for the project to strengthen early warning systems for floods, and the associated contributions that could be gained to addressing impacts of climate hazards.

- With regards to Outputs 3.1.3, please consider and explain the extent to which "Improved Technologies for sustainable charcoal production and sustainable wood fuel" are an effective way to address climate impacts; or alternatively delete this focus with corresponding adjustment to the budget.

- For Output 3.1.4, please be more explicit in terms of what of "Climate resilient agroforestry production systems will be identified and developed? If it is not feasible to do at this stage, please indicate this will be defined during the PPG phase.

- With regards to Component 4, please clarify the intended actors and audience of the outcomes and outputs, and how this will strengthen

- Please provide more explicit focus in design of the set of components to addressing current and anticipated impacts of specific climate hazards on the populations in the project target areas. Components 2 and 3, in particular, will be strengthened with focus and explanation of the impacts of current and anticipated climate hazards that will be addressed, and why are these interventions effect ways to do so.

- Importantly, please strengthen articulation of how the proposed project (PIF) will help in reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases in the future (zoonotic or otherwise), while increasing the resilience of the ecologic and socio-economy systems, including for example these possible approaches: Protect and restore natural systems and their ecological functionality; focus on production landscapes and land use practices within them to decrease the risk of human/nature conflicts; innovation in climate change mitigation and resilience; and engagement with the private sector.

Agency Response

22 April

Addressed. Thanks.

19 April

The Portal does not allow highlighting changes in table B. Hence, let us summarise the changes in table B:

- Component names have been changed to strengthen the climate resilience logic, and emphasise the FLR is a means to an end, i.e. climate adaptation.
 - o Component 1 Reducing vulnerability to climate change through inclusive integrated land-use planning (previously named Strengthening at multiple scales the integrated and inclusive use planning and governance for enhanced resilience).
 - o Component 2 Promotion of ecosystem-based approaches for enhanced resilience of both the landscapes and the local communities (previously named Scaling up of sustainable natural resources management mechanisms and restoration of degraded landscapes for enhanced resilience of the landscape);
 - o Component 3 Promotion of climate-smart nature-based livelihood interventions to decrease the risk of human/nature conflicts (previously named Promotion of resilient, nature-based livelihood interventions)
 - o Component 4 Knowledge, learning and M&E (previously named Coordination mechanism, learning, knowledge management and M&E)
- All outcomes have been amended, as well as a limited number of outcome indicators.
- Finally, all outputs have been slightly revised, with the exception of 3.1.1 and 4.1.1.

Please, refer to the word version of the PIF with changes in yellow and TT.

Please, consider the amended outcomes and outputs.

On risks of infectious diseases, please note that the language in the PIF has been strengthened.

15 April

Project area selection: The targeted project areas are those where most people live due to conflict. The consequential pressure of human

Basin - Forests and climate change. Eds : de Wasseige C., Tadoum M., Eba'a Atyi R. and Doumenge C. – 2015 (OFAC/COMIFAC) to the point that these ecosystems lose their ecological integrity and capacity to provide ecosystem goods and services to local populations.

Climate focus: Modifications have been made particularly in table B and descriptive sections of the project components to strengthen the climate focus.

Component 1: A landscape/ecosystem approach is proposed to mainstream nature-based solutions as adaptation options into local land use planning. Strengthening governance at multiple scales is key to achieve climate change adaptation and will mitigate potential conflicts related to land and natural resource use.

Outcome 1.1: Please consider amendments in table B and descriptive part of the component, which now better reflect that sustainable integrated landscape management is a strategy to achieve climate adaptation.

Output 1.1.1: Do consider the literature referenced in the PIF (CIFOR, 2015 FAO, Global Mechanism of the UNCCD) on the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project intervention strategy, which is anchored in a landscape/ecosystem approach and nature-based solutions (including sustainable forest management and forest and landscape restoration) for increased system resilience.

Output 1.1.2: Where structures do exist, they will be strengthened. Nevertheless, the capacities at the local level are very limited, and therefore new structures will need to be established as well to ensure sustainable and adaptive management can be put in place.

Output 1.1.3: Please, consider the amended output in table B to address this query.

Component 2: Adaptive forest management plans and forest and landscape restoration plans are two important tools for forest and landscape adaptation enhancing the functionality of both forests and forest landscapes under multiple pressures of global change, in particular the alterations of growing conditions for forests due to climate change impacts (extreme weather events and accompanying pathogen pressures) (Spathelf et al, 2018). Local populations are depending upon forest and forest landscapes for their lives and livelihoods, therefore resilient forests and forest landscapes contribute to resilient populations. Please, do consider that climate change impacts and hazards are a key principles of FLR (GPFLR). Therefore, when proposing restoration solutions, climate hazards are integrated. For instance, species selection will consider future drought, temperature trends. Amendments have been made to the PIF in various sections (table B, description of problem, and narrative of component 2) to clarify this link. Also output 2.1.3 has been integrated into 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

Component 3: Nature based solutions (including sustainable forest management and forest and landscape restoration) are documented cost-effective climate risk mitigation measures, that also have multiple biophysical and socio-economic co-benefits alternative risk mitigation measures may not have. Therefore, mainstreaming nature-based solutions (SFM, FLR) into management plans contributes directly to climate risk management.

On early warning systems, please know that the project will coordinate with the UNDP LDCF project referenced in the PIF. This project, in its inception phase, foresees the development of early warning systems. During PPG all elements will become available to ensure results of the UNDP-LDCF project are fully integrated in the management plans and efforts are complementary.

Output 3.1.3: This output has been eliminated

Output 3.1.4: Indeed, answering this question warrants more information, which will become available during PPG. To this end, a stronger engagement of research institutions and extension services is needed. A output has been added (3.1.3, which is entirely different from the original output) and the output 3.1.4 has been reformulated in part.

Component 4: The outcome and outputs have been revisited to better reflect the knowledge hierarchy (knowledge capture, development dissemination) and the better integrate the different target groups at different levels, from local to regional.

Climate hazards impacts on people: Please, consider the responses provided in previous queries about the project's intervention logic, which hinges on a landscape/ecosystem management approach, inherently embedding climate change hazards.

Reducing the risk of emerging infectious diseases: Resilience in the project intervention logic is interpreted in a rather comprehensive fashion, and therefore includes building less vulnerable communities to pandemics, putting in place the infrastructure to build back better, such as short value chains, livelihood diversification, extension services that easily and promptly address health related concerns so they do not become social, economic and environmental crises, etc. The project intervention logic has the potential to addresses critical issues around human-wildlife interaction (including increased exposure to viruses), and the landscape management plans will integrate this concern. The project approaches do offer opportunities to reduce future risk of zoonotic and other diseases to spill over to the human world, from the natural world, as it addresses the causes of forest ecosystem degradation, halts the degradation and restores the ecosystems. The causal links between protected and restored natural systems and their ecological functionality have been documented (<https://www.cifor.org/event/strengthening-the-connection-between-forests-biodiversity-and-health-in-the-one-health-approach/>, <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/65326/terrain-through-the-lens-of-the-covid-19-pandemic-blueprint-for-a-healthy-planet?fnl=en>), and the landscape management and governance work of the project are an opportunity to fully address concerns with forest boundaries, altered habitats, increasing pressure on ecosystems.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Please include all sources of Recurrent expenditures in table C.

Please provide indicative sources of Agency co-finance at the PIF stage, which will then be confirmed at CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Table C indicates total co-financing of \$30 million, but the sources add up to \$29 million and the text explanation indicates \$29 million. Please clarify this total co-financing amount in tables A and D.

Please indicate the full name for the co-financiers "MEDD" and "MADR".

Will there any be any co-financing provided by the Implementing Agency, FAO?

Agency Response

19 April 2021

Please, note that the recurrent expenditures of MEDD and MADR are mentioned in table C. There is now an additional row for FAO's co-finance as well.

2 Technical Cooperation Projects, investments from FAOs regular budget, have been identified as co-finance, to be reconfirmed during PPG.

15 April

Please, do consider that USD1M of the co-finance is recurrent expenditure and therefore not explained in the table C footnote. USD30M is confirmed as the correct figure for co-finance, including USD29M of mobilized investment and USD1M of recurrent expenditure.

MEDD stands for Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and MADR for Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development

Please, consider that for some of the baseline projects (e.g. Peacebuilding Funded project listed), FAO is a co-executing agency, but not the resource partner. Therefore, it is not mentioned as source of the mobilized investment. Further opportunities will be defined during PPG.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

SECRET/CONFIDENTIAL

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 17April2021:

trained, project IDs, etc.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please remove the indicator figure provided for indicator 11 of Trust Fund Project, as this is an LDCF project. Please consider opportunities to strengthen impact ambition in this project. Please see comments below in response to Question 6 in Part 2.

Agency Response

19 April 2021

The metadata and CI worksheet has been fully completed. Apologies for the oversight.

15 April 2021

The amendment has been made, and the targets are only featured in the LDCF metadata and core indicators worksheet.

On project impact ambition, the design team considers that the context warrants a cautious estimate at PIF stage (estimates are aligned with published per ha costs of restoration, please see <http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CB1600EN> in Unasylva). Nevertheless, a reasoned effort has been made to increase targets and further assessments carried out during PPG will confirm project ambition.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Given the reference to Indigenous People made in the PIF, please indicate this in the taxonomy.

Agency Response This has been done.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Cleared as sufficient at the PIF stage. Please note the comments below to be expanded on during PPG.

GEFSEC 18April2021:

We note with appreciation the additional information on climate hazards and their impacts in CAR (including in paras 25, 25, 28, 29, 30), including the anticipated impacts of climate change for a medium-term scenario period on yields of maize and tropical cereals that are of particular importance to smallholder farmers. We especially appreciate the brief indication of examples of the adaptation options in the agriculture sector, "...such as shifting of crops, promotion of heat-tolerant cultivars, and promoting trees in agroforest systems which have a cooling effect on surrounding crops that can significantly mitigate the impacts of heat stress...). The PIF would be strengthened by briefly expanding on these indicative examples of adaptation options (including relevant approaches to the broadly defined approach of ecosystem restoration), particularly for the forestry and broader natural resources sectors as defined for table 2 given their focus of this project along side agriculture. We appreciate these adaptation solutions will be defined in greater depth and in a more participatory manner with relevant stakeholders during the PPG stage, but further initial indication at PIF stage is encouraged.

During PPG, please expand on this initial identification of specific adaptation options that can be effective solutions to the specified climate impacts, to be advanced through the project interventions, including outcome 3.1, to strengthen resilient livelihood strategies including through climate resilient agricultural practices, ecosystem restoration, etc. Please also continue to identify available information on climate hazards and their impacts in CAR, for incorporating into design of interventions to be defined in further detail in the CEO Endorsement package.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please see the set of comments above in response to the review sheet Question 2 in Part 1.

To compliment and provide a basis for the information on climate impacts in paragraph 6, using best available information - we suggest table 2 would be strengthened by expanding on the very limited information on the indicated climate hazards ("Excessive drought, Excessive rainfall"), with analysis of current and anticipated climate hazards (preferably using different climate scenarios) that are driving the stated impacts. For example, paragraph 25 refers to increases in temperature, which is a climate hazard that will logically also drive impacts. Also, to what extent is the rainfall and drought hazards a factor of changing trends or increased variability? Sharper analysis of the climate impacts and hazards that will be addressed through the project interventions is important because different solutions to be advanced through this project may be relevant for addressing impacts of different climate hazards. As indicated in response to Question 2 Part 2, please review and revise relevant sections of the PIF to ensure clear and direct focus on the climate adaptation problem and impacts.

Noting the climate information provided in paragraphs 22 to 26, the climate rationale of this project would be sharpened by further

the interventions of this project.

With further regards to Table 2, why are climate impacts only referenced for the agriculture sector, and not for the forestry sector, given focus on this sector in the project components. Please broaden the analysis of current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards to include other relevant sectors related to land use beyond just agriculture.

Importantly, how do the drivers of deforestation indicated in paragraph 27 relate to the climate change problem (current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards) that will be addressed through this project? If they don't, please cut outputs and activities and associated budget designed to address them.

The sentiment in the comment above about relation to the climate problem and proposed project support is also relevant to paragraphs 31-36, as well as 38-49. Please reframe these paragraphs to sharpen the links of these issues or others more directly to the climate problem and the solutions to be advanced from finance requested from this project. In doing so, please consider if other approaches are needed to address the climate problem through this project.

7. The PIF seems to indicate that conflict and insecurity are the main theme that causes of food insecurity and natural resources exploitation. Presumably, achieving political agreement amongst different factions will be crucial to address this conflict. To what extent is the problem climate change related? In its current form, the PIF does not attempt to articulate the relationship between climate problems as drivers for conflict and insecurity. Please consider the the climate change - conflict and insecurity linkages, particularly the nature and extent of climate as a driver or influence on conflict and insecurity.
8. Please consider removing the heading of "uncontrolled and unsustainable...", as this does not appear to be a barrier to the ongoing problem, but is actually an outcome of the barrier. Alternatively, please revise accordingly.

Agency Response

22 April

Comment noted. Thanks.

19 April 2021

Thank you for the comment and appreciation. Some examples of agricultural solutions have been added in the component 3 description, and will be expanded upon during PPG.

15 April

Information on climate impacts and current and future scenarios: There are important data gaps specifically for CAR and little information is available for the Congo Basin. The available information has been mined (Observatoire du Congo, CIFOR, State of the Congo Basin Forest, GAIN, ...) and updates have been made in the PIF.

Climate impacts on forestry sector: Table 2 now includes information from the NAPA on forest/natural resources particularly.

PIF's threats and vulnerabilities section. In summary, climate change exacerbates existing pressures on forests and forest ecosystems (source CIFOR).

Climate change as a cause of conflict and insecurity: Insufficient information and evidence is available to draw a direct link (https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Juergen-Scheffran/publication/333005004_Climate_and_Conflict_in_Africa_Oxford_Research_Encyclopedia_of_Climate_Science/links/5d750df6299bf1cb8091b68a/Climate-and-Conflict-in-Africa-Oxford-Research-Encyclopedia-of-Climate-Science.pdf?origin=publication_detail). The causes of conflict and insecurity are multiple and inter-connected in CAR. Climate change is potentially one causal factor that leads to internal displacement, from the Northern drought affected areas of the country (also receiving refugees from Chad) towards the safer and less affected South-Western part of the country. These migrations are oftentimes accompanied by land tenure conflicts, particularly in a context of high dependence on rainfed agriculture and NTFPs.

Barriers: The barrier was changed into lack of sustainable adaptive management and restoration plans. Also reference to the International Union of Forest Research Organizations IUFRO experience and work on Forest Adaptation and Restoration under Global Change has been added (<https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s13595-018-0736-4.pdf>).

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared as sufficient at this stage.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

- Current vulnerability to the impacts of climate change is described in paragraph 18. To the extent possible, please provide more localised information on climate hazards and impacts, based on best available information. Climate impact on the agriculture sector is noted para 24. References is also made on how RCP scenario 6 is likely to impact coffee production. However, no such impacts on the forestry sector are described. Please strengthen for coffee and/or other relevant crops.
- 2. Baseline (ongoing) projects are provided in the tabular format. Further elaboration on ongoing projects or recently concluded projects in the current proposed project area will also be important to understand synergies, avoid duplications and scaling up of efforts.
- 3. Please include reference to ratification of relevant international agreements, including the Paris Agreement under the UNFCCC.

3

3,

Agency Response

1. Thank you for the suggestion and comprehension data is not always available. Some localized information on non-timber forest products (caterpillars) is in the PIF, referencing therefore the forestry sector. Some additional language has been provided on climate change hazards and impacts on food crops such as maize and cassava.
2. Further information has been provided on current projects to highlight synergies, avoid duplication and coordinate scaling-up efforts.
3. Please, consider the information provided in table 5 and paragraph 101.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- **GEFSEC 19April2021:**

- Cleared as sufficient at this stage.

-

- **GEFSEC 25March2021:**

Similar to comments in response to other questions, the articulation of the proposed alternative scenario needs to be strengthened with clearer articulation and design of how the project interventions will directly address the climate change adaptation problem (current and anticipated impacts of climate hazards). In general, the proposed interventions are targeted for addressing non-climatic pressure on ecosystem function such as land degradation, unsustainable agriculture practices. Just as one of the several specific examples to be revised, its not clear if and how landscape planning and restoration is an objective in its own right or for other objectives other than an efficient way to strengthen climate adaptation and resilience action. Perhaps this is a cost effective way to do so, but this is not sufficiently clearly articulated and backed up with best available information.

Although schematic diagram of the ToC is provided, it could be useful to briefly outline the ToC in the narrative section.

Below are a series of suggestions for strengthening:

Component 1:

- This component contains useful contributions towards implementing CAR's decentralization policies. However, it will be useful to provide a comprehensive list of ongoing baseline projects/activities that this proposed project can built-on and take it forward. For example, reference is briefly made in the PIF to UNDP and AFD projects, but the specific project titles are not indicated and are not

Resilience in CAR" would be useful to ensure meaningful capacity building to integrate climate change adaptation into local planning process.

- It will be useful to provide a brief description of the current planning process at the local level, so as to identify entry points for integration or explore options to provide further support for institutional coherence for climate adaptation integration.
- Output 1.1.1: Is there one or more specific priority sector that will be targeted for integrating climate change adaptation into planning process? While it will be useful to cover all sectors, the project might be overly stretched if it tries to focus on all sectors. Please consider focus on the Agriculture and Forestry sectors.

Component 2

- This component can be the logical next step from the component 1. As the indicated by brief narrative section, the actions under this component should be a "roll-out" of the various capacity building, planning tools and coordination mechanism put in place in outcome 1. Therefore, the title of the component as "Scaling-up...." seems to be misleading. Also, the focus of the outputs under this component can be construed as land degradation or biodiversity actions, and less so on climate adaptation. Please revise accordingly. Additionally, a brief articulation on the role of nature (biodiversity and soil integrity) for climate adaptation would strengthen.

Component 3

- Please clarify the direct relevance of technology transfer on charcoal use and cooking stoves to climate change adaptation and its cost efficiency as an investment for climate adaptation impact, or delete this focus. In doing so, please consider strengthening technology transfer of agroforestry practices to its impact potential to directly improving the adaptive capacity of food production systems to withstand impacts of climate hazards.
- Output 3.1.1: This output appears to be somewhat of a repetition of output 1.1.2. Therefore, please consider consolidating these outputs.
- Output 3.1.3: This may be outside the scope of climate change adaptation. If so, please remove and adjust the budget accordingly.

Additional output for consideration: As mentioned elsewhere in the document, please consider feasibility and impact potential of address the barriers related to complex land tenure and institutions around it, so as to encourage private investment for climate resilience in natural resource management sectors.

Agency Response

Addressing climate change adaptation problems: Please, consider answers provided to previous questions, where the project intervention logic and approaches are explained. In order to strengthen this narrative in the PIF, the table B and the component descriptions have been amended.

ToC narrative: The ToC provided will be an important tool to engage stakeholders in consultations, and will be subject to further iterations during the PPG phase. It merely highlights the drivers of communities' and landscapes vulnerability, the barriers faced to adequately respond to the problem faced, the project intervention strategy and the expected results expressed in adaptation benefits. It therefore follows the general flow of the PIF. Considering this, we propose a visual representation of a partially filled ToC at PIF stage. It will be discussed,

Component 1:

- More information on baseline projects has been provided and reference to the highlighted ones is made in the PIF.
- Reference is made to Local Development Planning at commune level and support carried out by WB and AFD to strengthen the capacities to develop these plans. The focus of this support was more on pure development issues (such as infrastructure, education, health) and less on climate change integration. Both at decentralized and national level capacity to support climate change integration in development planning is very limited.
- Output 1.1.1: At the local (commune level) the main sectors addressed (also consider the ecosystem-based approach promoted by the project) are forestry and agriculture. Nevertheless, a landscape approach does promote further sector integration. Project investments will however be limited to agriculture and forestry sectors.

Component 2

- The language has been revised. Thank you.

Component 3

- The output on charcoal use and cooking stoves has been eliminated.
- Output 3.1.1: This output has been merged with output 1.1.2.
- Output 3.1.3: This output has been removed, and replaced by a capacity development programme for national research institutions and extension services, as they will support the local communities to implement climate-smart production systems/NTFP value chains.
- Additional output for consideration: Thank you for the suggestion. The PIF proposes the following approach (reference has been made to case studies supporting this approach) to the complex land tenure issues: securing community forests secure local communities' rights to manage the forests, making investment, management, etc. more likely.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Almost. Kindly note and address remaining comments above.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Partially. Kindly note and address comments in response to other questions in this review sheet.

Agency Response

19 April

Please, consider the suggested amendments.

15 April

Please, do consider responses to earlier questions/comments.

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 17April2021:

Cleared. Please remember to indicate the total figure of core indicator 4 (cell C14).

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please consider opportunities to significant increase the number of direct beneficiaries, noting consideration such as the total population of CAR is approximately 4.8 million; a calculation of how many people live in or whose livelihood is directly impacted by climate resilience of

agriculture which is a significant focus of this project (as indicated in paragraph 4); and 72% of rural people in the CAR depend partly or

entirely on NTFPs (as indicated in paragraph 8) and importance of forestry sector to the economy (paragraph 7); and the focus of the project on system level transformations including land-use planning, sustainable land management plans, etc. Also, please remember to indicate the total number in the Core Indicators sheet (in cell 9C) of the document, which is not currently done.

- Please also consider opportunities to significantly increase the number of hectares under climate resilient management, with similar considerations as conveyed above for number of people.

- The numbers of policies/plans as well as total people trained seem quite low. Please consider opportunities to increase.

Agency Response

19 April 2021

Added. Thanks.

15 April

The financial and organizational cost of implementation in CAR is high, and the estimates are based on ongoing GEF projects, and are in line with other funded programmes in the country and project area. The infrastructure and security context is a limiting factor to propose much higher estimates at this moment. Nevertheless, the ambition was raised slightly in terms of number of beneficiaries. For now, the number of hectares under climate resilient management remains unvaried, but will be assessed in depth during PPG.

The number of policies and plans and people trained have been increased slightly.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared as adequate at this stage.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please consider opportunities to strengthen the currently limited innovation through this project, and incorporating them in Component 3 or a new component.

As one example, in order to address the challenge of smallholder farmers and MSMEs to access credit for investing in climate resilient practices and provision of climate adaptation goods and services, is there potential to partner with microfinance institutions by

example: <https://www.thegef.org/project/blended-finance-facility-climate-resilience-coffee-and-cacao-value-chains-cc-blend>)? As

mentioned in Question 2 of part 2, given the challenge of smallholder farmers and MSMEs to access credit for investing in climate resilient practices and provision of climate adaptation goods and services, is there potential to partner with microfinance institutions by guaranteeing a line of credit for lending products targeting climate adaptation and resilience?

Alternatively, is there potential to partner with a commercial Equity Fund for other investment vehicle in climate resilient enterprises? Please consider initial models of the growing number of climate adaptation and resilience funds and investment vehicle are successfully piloted in other LDCs and conflict prone countries which it may be feasible for this project to learn from, expand on, and/or partner with, including including by the Global Resilience Partnership and UNDP <https://www.thegef.org/project/resilience-peace-stability-food-and-water-security-innovation-grant-program>; with Conservation International and the Lightsmith Group: <https://www.thegef.org/project/structuring-and-launching-craft-first-private-sector-climate-resilience-adaptation-fund> and <https://www.thegef.org/project/adaptation-sme-accelerator-project-asap>; and/or with the Southpole Group and WWF: <https://www.thegef.org/project/investment-readiness-landscape-resilience-fund>.

We note the reference in paragraph 69 to livelihoods of stakeholders being "guaranteed". Please consider if "guaranteeing" this is realistic and revise.

Additionally, consideration of how to address the barrier of clear property rights would contribute to innovation. Please see related comment above.

Agency Response

Thank you for the suggested amendments and sources. Some amendments have been made to the language (e.g. guaranteed has been smoothed in the previous paragraph 69, now paragraph 76) as a result. Please, consider that microcredit facilities are quite limited in CAR and only 10% of women and 18% of men own an account (Global Findex Database) and it accounts for 1 percent of the total credit facilities serving 0.5 percent of the population. As such the project will build on ongoing WB project supporting SMEs access an agricultural incubator in Bangui. The project will also follow a similar approach currently used in the GEF-6 TRI project to build the capacity of local stakeholders to develop bankable business plans and provide small grants to be able to connect to the limited microcredit/bank facilities in the country. Reference is made under component 3 and in synergies with ongoing projects.

In order to address the last comment, some language on community forest rights has been added. This is well aligned with finding from a recent FAO report on benefits of community managed forests/ indigenous peoples managed forests (<http://www.fao.org/americas/publicaciones-audio-video/forest-gov-by-indigenous/en/>).

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Thank you for providing the map. However, we note the coloring of the map does not quite match the list of prefectures. Specifically, 2 prefectures indicated on the map are not included in the list.

Agency Response The wrongly mapped prefecture has been corrected.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared for this stage. We note more thorough in person consultations with all relevant stakeholders will be conducted during PPG. In the CEO Endorsement package, please provide explanation of these stakeholder engagements and their outcomes.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

We note some stakeholder consultations for this project have carried starting from the beginning of 2020. However, based on the information provided, it appears the consultations have been limited in depth and breadth, especially in terms of in person consultation. Please clarify if this is the case, and the extent to which this has been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. In doing so, please consider and articulate in the PIF opportunities to deepen and broaden stakeholder consultations at relevant stages of the project including its preparation.

Agency Response

19 April

The Agency confirms to report on stakeholder consultations during PPG and integrate a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan (with budget) for implementation.

15 April

Indeed, although a national technical working group was established at the beginning of 2020, consultations have been seriously limited both by the COVID-19 pandemic containment measures as well as ongoing elections. As national elections have been concluded, and national Government and Ministries will be fully functional in 2021, and COVID vaccination programmes are being rolled out, a more conducive context for in-depth consultations during PPG is expected.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 24April2024:

Cleared. We note with appreciation the additions in the PIF stakeholder engagement section on institutions and organizations focussed on gender issues who will be engaged in project preparation.

GEFSEC 22April2021:

It is well noted that a gender specialist will be engaged in order to conduct a gender assessment and develop a gender action plan during project preparation, which will dedicated gender outputs, indicators and targets, the promotion of gender-transformative tools and approaches (such as the embedded Dimitra Clubs and Farmer Field Schools), and more. As indicated in the GEFSEC comment below from 21April2021, please indicate any government or civil society actors focused on gender issues who will be engaged during the PPG stage in project preparation, as well as elaboration on measures to ensure gender responsive consultation during PPG phase that will inform project development.

GEFSEC 21April2021:

It is well noted that the some gender considerations were included in the PIF submission. It is, however, unclear how the project intends to make sure proper participation and engagement of all relevant stakeholder groups, including women and youth during project development. Neither the gender or stakeholder section of the PIF specify or identify any specific groups or local/national ministries responsible for gender equality. Please elaborate on measures to ensure gender responsive consultations to inform project development.

Yes

Agency Response

23 April

Please, do consider the stakeholders focused on gender equality mentioned in the Stakeholder section. Additional language has been added on specific ways to engage women during PPG in the Stakeholder section.

21 April

Thank you for the comment. Please, note that during the PPG phase, a gender specialist will be engaged in order to conduct a gender assessment and develop a gender action plan. FAO developed a step-wise guide on how to successfully integrate gender in GEF/LDCF project design and implementation, and this guide will be followed, ensuring the PPG phase is already used to sensitize stakeholder groups on the need to properly address gender equality and women empowerment in climate change adaptation projects, in addition to a comprehensive approach to project design that embraces gender equality and women empowerment.

The PIF sections Gender and Stakeholder Engagement have some additional language in this perspective.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared for this stage. We note further consultation and collaboration with the limited microfinance sectors will be advanced at PPG stage, in order to enable access to capital for the enterprises that will receive business planning support through this project. Please further define opportunity to strengthen this aspect of the project prior to CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

- Please see the comments with regards to question 7 in Part 2 above, and consider opportunities to strengthen innovation in terms of private sector engagement.
- Paragraph 66 makes brief reference to the currently low levels of financial inclusion in CAR, and potential of microfinance to increase credit facilities, serve a greater percentage of the population, and contribute to climate resilience of people and hectares. We encourage consideration of strong focus on this opportunity.

hindered at least in part by the policy environment. Please consider strengthening explicit focus in this project to address barriers to private investment for adaptation and resilience in CAR.

- We note the indication in paragraph 92 that partnerships and co-financing potential will be identified during the PPG phase.

Agency Response

- Thank you. Do consider our response under question 7.
- The project will build on ongoing experience developing the capacity of SMEs to develop sustainable business plans in order to be able to attract financing. This will be both pursued virtually following the model from TRI as well as built on incubator work carried out in the context of a WB project.
- The WB is partnering with micro-credit facilities and banks in Bangui to provide start-up funding. The LDCF project could build on this effort to lift barriers to capture private investment. Nevertheless, micro-finance facilities in the country remain limited.
- Indeed, with the possibility to consult face-to-face, during PPG the private sector will be engaged potentially as co-financier as well. Involving the private sector is key especially in the PEAs in South-Western CAR, and the project will build on the PPP experience being piloted under the ongoing TRI project where private company is providing technical assistance to local farmers to develop agroforestry systems both within the concession as on the farmer field.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 20April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 18April2021:

The further consideration of COVID-19 related risks is well noted, thank you.

We also note the further explanation of the security related risks and risk mitigation efforts in the response below. Please ensure the relevant text on this is incorporated in the PIF itself.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please strengthen the mitigation measure for the risk of returning to widespread conflict and violence. Although the project interventions aim to support social cohesion, what are the specific risk mitigation measures if there is a return to widespread conflict and violence?

Moreover, is there some risk that the current levels of conflict and violence will hinder project implementation for some of the activities in some or all of the target areas? If so, what is the level of this risk and what are the mitigation measures?

With regards to the high risk of political instability, does this involve risk to national or provincial level engagement in the project (as well as local level risk mitigation that is mentioned), and if so how will this be mitigated? Are there any past experiences where in CAR in which the risk of political instability to project implementation has been effectively mitigated by engagement of engaging local NGOs? Moreover, the narrative in part of this PIF suggests that some of the GEF projects are being negatively impacted by the conflicts. Please expand on this, and indicate how this particular project will avoid the same problems.

Please strengthen the Risk and mitigation measure related to the COVID-19 Pandemic. For example, is there a risk that certain project preparation and/or implementation activities will be delayed or unable to be carried out due to COVID related restrictions and safety measures, such as international or domestic travel and in person meetings and stakeholder engagement consultations? If so, how will these risks be mitigated? Related risk considerations related to the Covid 19 pandemic you may wish to consider referring to and defining mitigation strategies for include for example: availability of technical expertise and capacity and changes in timelines; enabling environment; financing/co-financing; and future risks of similar crises.

Agency Response

19 April

The language on risk has been included in the PIF.

15 April

Mitigating the risk of conflict: The project will engage, to the extent possible, local NGOs and CSOs as execution partners, generally less impacted by conflict with respect to national or international development partners. To this end, the project focuses on strengthening the capacities to adapt to climate change of local community groups, as agents of change.

Working in a context of insecurity: The project will promote as much as possible collaboration with localized NGOs and institutions for on the ground implementation to mitigate potential risk of not being able to execute due to UN rules and regulations. Insecurity has paralysed many development projects, particularly if not emergency related. Nevertheless, some successful experiences can be cited, e.g. PDRSO project, delivering results at the local level during the past few years.

The Covid-19 related risk has been further developed.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared as sufficient at this stage. We note the institutional arrangements will be further specified during PPG, including confirmation that MEDD will be the Executing Partner; a diagram and confirmation the PMU will be housed at the MEDD; relationship of the PSC with REDD+ Committee and national climate coordination; etc.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

- Please clarify who will be the Project Executing Partner(s) for this project.
- Please clarify where the Project Management Unit will be institutionally housed/based, what will be its functions, and who it will report to. Will there also be a Project Implementation Unit, and if so what will be its functions, who will it report to, and where will it be based?
- Given the complexities indicated in this PIF, it would be useful to include a visual diagram of the GEF Implementation Agency, OFP office, Steering Committee, and PMU of this project, and other relevant actors will related to each other, including how the inter-prefectural REDD+ committees and Local Development committees will be represented in the overall decision making and implementation coordination of the project.
- We note the indication in paragraph 97 that "The experience of creating a partnership with the private sector to enhance the resilience of local communities will also be useful for the project.". Please indicate how this will be achieved.
- Is it anticipated that the national REDD+ committee will be used as the project steering committee? If so, to what extent is this viable given the REDD+ committee is chaired by Honorable Prime Minister, and the need for technical oversight?

Agency Response

- The main executing partner will be the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD), but other relevant ministries will also play a critical role. The detailed institutional arrangements will need to be discussed during PPG.
- The details of the PMU (role, responsibilities, composition, location,...) have not been confirmed yet, but it is the intention to house the PMU within the HQ of the executing partner, the MEDD.
- A visual of the institutional arrangements of the project is premature as this has not been discussed and validated by all relevant stakeholders. It is a main element of the PPG consultation.

discuss potential roles and responsibilities.

- The Project Steering Committee will be chaired by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and there will be a link to the national REDD+ committee as there also will be a link to the national climate coordination.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Yes. However, please include information on relevance to the following: Government's decentralization policy; Forest policy; 2011-2015 Strategy for rural development, Agriculture and Food Security.

Agency Response This information has been added.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Cleared

GEFSEC 18April2021:

We note the response that the stakeholders are "mainly those on the ground". Please provide greater clarity.

Also, as requested in the comment of 25March, please briefly explain how the knowledge management proposed through this project will contribute to the results of this and/or other projects.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

As mentioned in response to Question 2 in Part 1, 7, with regards to Component 4, please clarify the intended actors and audience of the outcomes and outputs, and how this will strengthen results of this and/or other projects and broader initiatives. For example, in output 4.1.3, briefly, who are the "key stakeholders"?

Agency Response

19 April 2021

Additional language on contribution to project results of the KM and learning component has been provided in the KM section of the PIF. The KM section clarifies that there are different stakeholder groups. Local communities are the direct beneficiaries and therefore many of the knowledge and learning is geared towards them. Nevertheless, the project also aims at increased capacity ,awareness and engagement of national actors from government institutes, from research institutes, etc. Therefore, a number of knowledge and learning products is developed and disseminated for this audience in particular.

15 April

Please, consider that the stakeholders are mainly those on the ground: farmers, forest and farm producer groups, community forest associations.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Yes

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 25March2021:

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 24April2022:

The final remaining comment (gender engagement in project preparation) has been addressed. The PM recommends this PIF to be cleared.

GEFSEC 22April2021:

Please fully respond to the comment on gender elements during project development by including relevant indications in the PIF.

GEFSEC 21April2021:

Kindly note two specific additional comments (title; gender considerations during project preparation) and resubmit.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Please address the comments provided above with responses in the Review Sheet, as well as a revised PIF. In doing so, it would be greatly appreciated to kindly include a tracked changes version of the revised PIF, so its feasible to track the modifications.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 18April2021:

Stakeholder engagement: As indicated in the PIF, we note more thorough in person consultations with all relevant stakeholders will be

outcomes.

Private sector engagement and innovation: We note further consultation and collaboration with the limited microfinance sector will be advanced at PPG stage, in order to enable access to capital for the enterprises that will receive business planning support through this project. Please further define opportunity to strengthen this aspect of the project prior to CEO Endorsement.

Design of interventions to directly address climate impacts: Please expand on the initial identification of specific adaptation options that can be effective solutions to the specified climate impacts, to be advanced through the project interventions, including through outcome 3.1, to strengthen resilient livelihood strategies including through climate resilient agricultural practices, ecosystem restoration, etc. Please also continue to identify further relevant information as it becomes available on climate hazards and their impacts in CAR, for incorporating into design of interventions to be defined in further detail in the CEO Endorsement package.

GEFSEC 25March2021:

Co-financing: As stated in the PIF, please ensure partnerships and co-financing potential (including with private sector actors) be identified during the PPG phase.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/26/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

GEFSEC 24April2022:

GEFSEC 20April2021:

This PIF is recommended as technically cleared by the PM, pending any further comments from PPO on adherence to GEF policies.