

# Strengthening integrated approaches to build climate resilience of vulnerable rural communities and agricultural production systems in the central region of Segou in the Republic of Mali.

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10823

**Countries**

Mali

**Project Name**

Strengthening integrated approaches to build climate resilience of vulnerable rural communities and agricultural production systems in the central region of Segou in the Republic of Mali.

**Agencies**

IFAD

**Date received by PM**

6/18/2021

**Review completed by PM**

10/29/2021

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### 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 8Aug2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

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 11Oct2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 8Aug2021:**

Regarding Output 2.1, will 1000 ha of climate resilient species, essences and seeds be produced and distributed "to" 1000 households, or "by" 1000 households? Please clarify. Similarly, should Output 2.2 read "50 ha "for" 500 direct beneficiaries, or "by" 500 direct beneficiaries; and should Output 2.3 read ""with" 500 farmers or "by" 500 farmers. These clarifications are sought with a view to ensuring local ownership and sustainability of the strategies and outcomes.

Regarding Output 3.1 and 3.2, the number of farmers referenced (500 in output 3.1 and 250 in output 3.2) seem low. Please consider opportunities to increase ambition in this regard.

Regarding Output 3.1, please clarify if the general term of "organizational capacities" is referring to capacities to access finance and credit, or otherwise.

Regarding Outputs 4.1, 4.2, and 4.2, the number of people engaged appears low. Please identify opportunities to increase ambition in this regard.

Please note the comment below in Part II on gender elements needing to be more explicit in the project description.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

**Response 1.** It is **by** instead of **to** for output 2.1 and output 2.2. :

? **Output 2.1:** 1000 ha of Climate resilient species, essences and seeds are produced and distributed **by** 1000 households to support the climate resilience agricultural production systems by sustainably intensifying production

? **Output 2.2:** Local species with high commercial and medicinal value domesticated on 3,000 ha **by** 3,000 direct beneficiaries household and 21,000 indirect beneficiaries using agro- ecological horticultural practices to sustainably increase food security (at least 50% women)

- ? **Output 2.3:** Concrete agro-ecological measures to address the effects of drought, desertification and climate change are promoted on 2,500 ha **with** 1000 farmers through the FFS to support the climate resilience agro-ecological production systems by sustainably intensifying production (disaggregated by Gender 50 % women)

**Response 2.** The number of farmers referenced have been increased after consultations with the national partners

- ? **Output 3.1:** Organizational capacities of 2,500 Farmers (at least 50% women and 30% youth) from 50 communities are strengthened to address issues related to climate impacts on value chains development.
- ? **Output 3.2:** Appropriate technical tools and integrated approaches to climate change adaptation are adopted by 2,500 (at least 50% women and 30% youth) beneficiaries in 50 communities.

**Response 3.**

Output 3.1: The term organizational capacities of 2500 Farmers? from 50 communities refers to improving resilient rural market access by reducing transaction costs, strengthening producer bargaining power to access climate resilient inputs and technologies , access to climate to financing including climate finance and enabling collective action against climate change

**Response 4.**

After consultations with our partners, the number under output 4 was increased.

- ? **Output 4.1:** Endogenous and exogenous knowledge on best available technologies and climate resilient practices for production and post-harvest processing are identified and disseminated to at least 3,000 direct beneficiaries for adoption (at least 50% women and 30% youth)
- ? **Output 4.2:** The results of the project are captured in an exit strategy for scaling with 3,000 direct beneficiaries and 21,000 indirect beneficiaries (at least 50% women and 30% youth)

- ? **Output 4.3:** 100 journalist and 200 community leaders trained on IACC approaches and 10 Social and environmental safeguard measures are identified and managed.

last point Noted

#### 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 18Nov2021:**

**Cleared**

**GEFSEC 5Nov2021:**

Please amend the following two entries:

- Green Climate Fund ? Source: change ?other? to ?Donor agency?.
- FAO ? Source: change ?GEF Agency? to ? Donor agency?.

Agency Response

**9 November 2021**

**Done**

**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 8Aug2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 6Aug2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 8Aug2021:**

Cleared

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 18Nov2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 5Nov2021:**

Part I, Table ?Core Indicators ? CDCF?, Core Indicator 2 ? please change target from 55.00 ha to 55,000 ha

**GEFSEC 11Oct2021:**

Thank you for the modest increases in number of people trained. However, the number of people trained seems quite low, particularly considering the significantly higher number of people with increased resilience. Will there be training involved associated with the activities to increase resilience of people (as captured by core indicator 1 on number of people). If so, please reflect this in the indicator for the number of people trained.

**GEFSEC 8Aug21:**

Please consider opportunity to increase the total number of people trained. Further, please consider and seek to identify opportunities for the the number of policies AND/OR plans, including at the community level, that will contribute to mainstreaming climate resilience to be greater than 3.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

The number of people trained have been increased

100 journalist and 200 community leaders trained , 1500 lead farmers, 1500 lead farmers on IACC approaches , and resilience building and 10 Social and environmental safeguard measures are identified and managed.

IFAD Agency - 21 October 2021

As per your recommendations and after consultations, we have included 1500 lead farmers to be trained. The targeted people to be trained are the leaders in the communities and they will influence the rest of the communities as per standards practices. This explain why you have the 200 community leaders and 1500 leader farmers. These lead farmers and community leaders serve as relays in their communities and villages .

As per the 100 journalists to be trained, the number is correct and we are talking about a project that on one region which is Segou not national. Topic on resilience is included as part of the training.

The activity has been updated as follow: Output 4.3: 100 journalist and 200 community leaders trained, 1500 lead farmers on IACC approaches, and resilience building and 10 Social and environmental safeguard measures are identified and managed.

9 November 2021

Done

#### **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 8Aug2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

#### **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 21Oct2021:**

Cleared as adequate at this stage. However, please note that aspects of climate rationale with a particular focus on future scenarios and how the project will address them will be required at CEO Approval stage.

### **GEFSEC 11Oct2021:**

Its appears that the following comment from 8Aug2021 has not been fully addressed yet: "Section II, "Project Description" para 6 references figures associated with anticipated climate hazards. Please clarify which RCP scenario these are referring to. We encourage referring to at least 2, and ideally 3 RCP scenarios (pessimistic, optimistic, and ideal one in between as well). Further, paras 7-8 on 'Projected Climate Change and Impacts' seems on only consider RCP4.5. Please consider a range, and the different impacts this may have." Please fully address this comment with revisions and additions to in the CER, and indicate the specific locations of revised text within the review sheet.

### **GEFSEC 8Aug2021:**

Please clarify and specify the geographic scope of the project. The title and several sections suggest it is the Segou Region while other sections suggest it includes other regions. Please clarify and ensure consistency throughout the PIF. In doing so, please explain why this region or regions were selected, and provide a clearer description of the climate, economic and development context in this particular part of the country. In doing so, please provide a sense of the total population size and number of hectares in the focus region(s).

Section II, "Project Description" para 6 references figures associated with anticipated climate hazards. Please clarify which RCP scenario these are referring to. We encourage referring to at least 2, and ideally 3 RCP scenarios (pessimistic, optimistic, and ideal one in between as well). Further, paras 7-8 on "Projected Climate Change and Impacts" seems on only consider RCP4.5. Please consider a range, and the different impacts this may have.

Paragraphs 7 to 17 (and particularly paras 7-9) seem to be considering impacts on regions throughout the country, although the project is focused on the Central Region of Segou. Please clarify if this is the case, or if all the regions listed are located within Segou, and focus the analysis of climate hazards and impacts as directly on p[ossible based on best available climate data for the specific region the project is focused on.

We note the barrier 4 of Limited investments in community agroforestry and livestock management and climate resilient agriculture. However, it is not sufficiently clear if the outcomes and outputs of the project are substantively designed to address this barrier.

For example, how will the project ensure that small holder farmers have access to capital to invest in the transition to more sustainable agricultural practices? This is important for success during project implementation as well as sustainability after the project ends. As one example, is there potential to engage with microlenders and microfinance institutions to develop accessible lending products for climate adaptation and resilience activities? Or are other approaches being considered to address the challenge of access to capital to make the transitions needed. This is especially crucial when transitioning food production options, such as from land based agriculture to fish farming, which will require capital? Please consider and include opportunities to more directly address this barrier.

### Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

#### **Response 1**

The project concerned Segou region. Reference to other region to compare Segou to other regions has been deleted . An entire section only on SEGOU has been included including the population, the area, etc. (see para 7 to 10)

#### **Response 2.**

Noted.

#### **Response 3.**

Para 7-10 with associated map focus only on SEGOU region

#### **Response 4.**

The project will help build a strong and bankable sub projects and initiatives under component 3 and 4 and demonstrate the profitability of the sector to financiers and businesses alike, encouraging other actors to participate in these markets later in time. These initiatives will be financed by the various projects identified and supported by IFAD such INCLUSIF and the concessional and green lines available at the Agricultural Banks of Mali and other Microfinance Institutions to improve access to investments. The IFAD main project which the GEF is complementing is fully dedicated on rural finance and already engaging microlenders and microfinance institutions to develop accessible lending products for climate adaptation and resilience activities.

In addition, IFAD is developing a GCF regional Funding proposal called Inclusive Green Financing Initiative (IGREENFIN): Greening Agricultural Banks & the Financial Sector to Foster Climate Resilient, Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture in the Green Great Wall (GGW) countries - Phase I. Mali and Segou is covered and the objective is support the greening of financial institutions ( the agricultural bank of Mali; and microfinance institutions ) through climate line of credit for adaptation and mitigation which targets farmers in all regions including SEGOU. The program also support the design of green lending products to build the resilience of value chains and farmers to climate change. The program is under final review and to be approved at the next GCF board of February 2022. With this facility being set up and ongoing investment provided by INCLUSIF project , the barrier related Limited investments in community agro forestry and livestock management and climate-resilient agriculture will be addressed and GEF resource refocused on the current activities in the PEF to avoid duplication. Synergies will be built at the PPG level.

The CN of this GCF program is available as well as the advanced Funding Proposal and IFAD is happy to share with the reviewer

The additional information is included under para 29

A range 'Projected Climate Change and Impacts' , and the different impacts this may have been included under para 6 with maps . These RCP 2.6; RCP 4.5, RCP 6.0 and RCP8.5,

28 October 2021

This is well noted. The design team will produce the all aspects of the climate rational with projections at design stage prior to CEO endorsement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

Cleared

**GEF 8August2021:**

There seems to be an incomplete sentence or title between paragraphs 26 and 27. Please clarify.

It appears the GCF funded projects "Africa Hydromet Program ? Strengthening Climate Resilience in Sub-Saharan Africa: Mali Country Project" is not considered. Please consider.

Several other GCF supported multi country projects benefitting Mali also focus on areas that seem to complement and potentially overlap with outputs of this project. Please

consider and explain. See here for a list of projects the GCF is supported in Mali: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/countries/mali>

Two GEF supported projects in Mali appear especially relevant to this project, but seem to not be considered. Please articulate how this project maximizes complementarity and ensures no overlap with the following projects "Climate security and sustainable management of natural resources in the central regions of Mali for peacebuilding and "Resilient, productive and sustainable landscapes in Mali's Kaye's Region

#### Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

Noted.

Noted. It is already in Table 1 (see the line after INCLUSIF).

Noted with thanks and included

During the preparation of the PIF, we organized various meetings with UNDP colleagues in charge of this project on climate security. This project is taken into account in table 1

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Please note the comments above in comment 1 of part II on address the challenge of access to finance.

#### Agency Response

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Yes

#### Agency Response

**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 8August2021:**

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 21Oct2021:**

Cleared.

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

Please note the further comment above on the core indicator related to number of people trained.

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Please note and address the comments above on increasing impact ambition.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

After consultations with the national authorities, the indicators have been revised

IFAD Agency-21 October 2021

The number of people trained has been adjusted with additional 1500 lead farmers included. The selected number of people ( 200 community leaders, 1500 lead farmers) are relays within the different communities and the training will include resilience building . See log frame , Para 46

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 29Oct2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC21Oct2021:**

In the Agency reply to this question, please indicate specifically where/how this comment has been addressed within the PIF document.

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

Please respond to the comment below provided on 8 August 2021.

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Please note the comments above on addressing access to capital for small holder farmers and SMEs to make the investments encouraged by the this project to more sustainable food production systems, as a way to contribute to the sustainability of the project interventions.

Agency Response

21 October 2021

all comments addressed Under Paragraph 29

28 October 2021

The comments are addressed under paragraph 29.

1. The project will help build strong bankable sub projects and initiatives under component 3 and 4 and demonstrate the profitability of the sector to financiers and businesses alike, encouraging other actors to participate in these markets later in time. These initiatives will be financed by the various projects identified and supported by IFAD such INCLUSIF and the concessional and green lines available at the Agricultural Banks of Mali and other Microfinance Institutions to improve access to investments . In addition, IFAD is also developing a GCF regional Funding proposal called Inclusive Green Financing Initiative (IGREENFIN): Greening Agricultural Banks & the Financial Sector to Foster Climate Resilient, Low Emission Smallholder Agriculture in the Green Great Wall (GGW) countries - Phase I. Mali and Segou are covered and the objective is support the greening of financial institutions ( the agricultural bank of Mali; and microfinance institutions ) through climate line of credit for adaptation and mitigation which targets farmers in all regions including SEGOU. The program also support the design of green lending products to build the resilience of value chains and farmers to climate change. The program is under final review and is expected to be approved at the next GCF Board meeting in February 2022. With this facility being set up and ongoing investment provided by the INCLUSIF project , the barrier related Limited investments in community agro forestry and livestock management and climate-resilient agriculture will be addressed, GEF resources will be used to address the other barriers to avoid duplication. Synergies will be built at the PPG level.

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEF 11 Oct 2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 8 August 2021:**

The map in section 1b of Part II provides a general circle for the region of Segou. Please provide a map that clearer specified the Segou region. Further, as indicated above, please clarify the geographic scope of the project, and whether it is just for Segou as indicated in the title or also Mopti as suggested in the table just above the project map.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

The map has been updated with the location ( Segou) and climate trend in Segou ( temperature and Precipitations), latest source from climate analytics , 2021

**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

**GEF 11 Oct 2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

We note the list of individuals in table 3 that were listed as having been met. Please provide an explanation of the nature and method of the discussions held. Further, please provide the full name (not just the anonym) of each organization met with, and to the extent possible a brief description of who they are and why they are relevant to the project.

Please indicate if any gender or women's organizations or government departments were met with in designing the PIF.

We note the substantial list of project stakeholders indicated in table 4. Please clarify how the "project stakeholders" in table 4 differ from the "List of Stakeholders" in table 3. Please clarify or combine. Please also clarify if all the stakeholders listed in table 4 have been met with in designing this project, and if so what the nature of the consultations have been?

**Agency Response**

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

**Response 1:**

Addressed with the name and title included .

**Response 2:**

Women's cooperatives for market gardening and rice cultivation, women Fisherfolk cooperatives, women cattle cooperatives have met during the PIF (some of them have been added in Table 3).

Table 3: List of Stakeholders met during the PIF design

Table 4: Potential Project stakeholders identified during the PIF design and to be involved in the PPG

**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

**GEF 21Octo2021:**

Cleared at this stage.

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

The response to the second comment below is unclear. What does "para 3-43- 60" mean?

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Please note and address the comment above on the extent to which women's organizations and/or relevant government agencies have been engaged in the design of this project.

We note with appreciation the indication in paragraph 6 of the section on gender that "...the project will contribution to ensuring that women access to capacities, resources for production, markets, and that their voices are heard and taken into account within decision making institutions." However, we do not see the articulation of ways to ensure this is the case included in the project description and relevant outputs. Please address.

**Agency Response**

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

Women's cooperatives for market gardening and rice cultivation, women Fisherfolk cooperatives, women cattle cooperatives have met during the PIF .

Done. See para 3-43- 60, in addition to indicators included in the logical framework

21 October 2021

Under the log frame. See Output 1.1.. Output 2.2., Output 2.3; Output 3.1; and 3.2 and outputs 4.1.4.2 and 4.3. All Outputs included a specific disaggregation on the percentage of women included which provide indication on how women beyond the activities on capacity building will be targeted . Setting such quota will allow the women to be included in the targeted activities per outputs

In the main document , it is reflected under paragraph 3, paragraph 43, paragraph 60

Additionally, a section on gender equality and women empowerment is under page 42-44 describe the ways to ensure this is the case included in the project description and relevant outputs

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 21Oct2021:**

Cleared

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

As for all comments, please include the relevant text provided in the response to the GEFSEC comment directly in the the PIF, and in the response below please indicate where this new text can be found in the PIF.

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

We note the statement that "...parallel private investments with full involvement of the private sector will be secured through Piveli and CNPV, ANPE." Please expand on this. For example, how will this occur?; who are these actors and how will they be involved; in what way will their investment be parallel to the project; etc.? Please also expand on MSMEs and small holder farmers will be engaged in financing transitions to more climate resilient practices.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

A mapping of co-financiers shows that parallel private investments with full involvement of the private sector will be secured through Piveli and CNPV (National centre for promoting volunteering), ANPE ( National Agency for the promotion of Entrepreneurship). The institutions support the emergence of new agri-preneurs , MSMEs ( input and equipment dealers, processors, transporters, wholesalers, retailers ) and their linkages with markets, and private investors including green financing from both Agricultural Banks of Mali and Microfinance Institutions which IFAD is partnering with under the Project INCLUSIF and the inclusive green finance program of the GCF. Under the Public, Private, Producers Partnership (4 P) model of IFAD, private sector engagement will be promoted on along the agriculture, forestry and fisheries value chains interested in providing climate resilient seeds, technologies, services and good that will contribute to the overall project goal.

21 October 2021

All the text is highlighted in yellow and paragraph mentioned

## **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

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

We note paragraph 8 of the risks section indicates "The LDCF Project will help IFAD projects to mainstream climate change into the agro-forestry...". Is the intention to help IFAD projects, or to help national and subnational stakeholders and beneficiaries? This is a crucial distinction. Please clarify.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

Indeed, it is to help national and subnational stakeholders and beneficiaries through IFAD funded project. The sentence has been corrected accordingly in the document.

**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 18Nov2021:**

Cleared as sufficient at this stage. However, in the future, including in Agency responses, to avoid possible confusion please consistently use GEF terminology with regards "Implementation" vs execution partners, as has been agreed with all GEF Agencies (e.g. IFAD is the Implementing Agency, and others are the "Executing" partners).

**GEFSEC 5Nov2021:**

Executing Partner in Portal (*Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development*) is not exactly the same as in the LoE ? actually, in the LoE there are two (instead of one) Executing Institutions (*Ministry of Environment, Sanitation and Sustainable Development and the Ministry of Agriculture*) ? please include in Portal the institutions included in LoE, as well as in section 6 - Coordination.

**GEFSEC 212021:**

Please clarify the Agency comment below, which was confusing in its articulation of who is the implementing vs executing partner. We understand IFAD will be the "GEF Implementing Agency partner", and the Agency for Environment for Sustainable Development will be the Executing partner for all activities.

**GEF 11Oct2021:**

Thank you for clarifying that the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development will be the Executing Partner. Please also reply to the second part of the question, which is whether IFAD is proposing for any component of the project to be self executed directly by IFAD!

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

In this section, please clarify if the intended primary project "executing partner" is the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development. Please also clarify if IFAD is proposing for any component of the project to be self executed directly by IFAD.

Agency Response

IFAD Agency - 24 September 2021

The Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development will be the executing partner and the sentence was added.

21 October 2021

IFAD is not going to implement any activity. Activities are implemented by Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development will be the Executing Partner in collaboration with sector ministries such as the ministry of agriculture. Further specific arrangement will be defined at PPG

28 October 2021

Yes that is correct.

IFAD: GEF Implementing Agency Partner

Agency for Environment for Sustainable Development: Project Executing Entity for all activities.

IFAD will not implement any activities, but will monitor implementation, and provide technical assistance where necessary and manage the identified risks as best possible.

This sentence has been further clarified in the PIF under the section coordination  
9 November 2021

The Institutions included in the LoE are now also in the portal.

IFAD is not going to implement any project activities, but will serve as the GEF Agency only. Activities will be implemented by the Agency for Environment and Sustainable Development, in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and other partners. Detailed implementation arrangements will be elaborated during project preparation. A few editorial amendments have been made in Section 6 to clarify IFAD's role.

#### **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 8 August 2021:**

Cleared as sufficient at this stage.

Agency Response  
**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

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Cleared

Agency Response

**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?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 5Nov2021:**

•The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and IFAD attached the Social Environmental and Climate Assessment Review Note (SECAR) in Annex 5. However, SECAR is available only in French. Please provide some additional detailed summary about type of risks for the CEO Approval stage.

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Cleared at this stage.

Agency Response

9 November 2021

A summary of the type of risks will be provided at the CEO approval stage

**Part 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 8August2021:**

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  
Agency Response

**GEFSEC 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 5Nov2021:**

Please address further policy oriented comments.

**GEFSEC 29Oct2021:**

All remaining comments have been addressed and this project is technically cleared, pending any further policy related comments from PPO.

**GEFSEC 21Oct2021:**

Please address the couple of final specific comments with clear responses.

**GEFSEC 11Oct2021:**

Please address the further comments.

**GEFSEC 8August2021:**

Please address the indicated comments.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**GEFSEC 21Oct2021:**

Aspects of climate rationale with a particular focus on future scenarios and how the project will address them will be required at CEO Approval stage.

**GEFSEC 18Nov2021:**

•The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and IFAD attached the Social Environmental and Climate Assessment Review Note (SECAR) in Annex 5. However, SECAR is available only in French. Please provide some additional detailed summary about type of risks for the CEO Approval stage.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>8/8/2021</b>	<b>9/24/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/11/2021</b>	<b>10/21/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/21/2021</b>	<b>10/28/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/29/2021</b>	<b>11/11/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/5/2021</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**