



Scaling up the Green Legacy Initiative best practices to enhance the climate resilience of smallholder farmers and disadvantaged groups in Ethiopia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11416

Countries

Ethiopia

Project Name

Scaling up the Green Legacy Initiative best practices to enhance the climate resilience of smallholder farmers and disadvantaged groups in Ethiopia

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

12/8/2023

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments Please refer to the technical comments which are important to confirm that this project meets the eligibility criteria.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you for your feedback. Please see responses below.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

The project objective articulates climate resilience as an objective with a focus on the most vulnerable. However, there are certain gaps.

The summary and the PIF in general lacks alignment and articulation of the project's alignment with the three strategic priorities of GEF 8 i.e. i) scaling up finance for adaptation, ii) innovation, tech transfer and private sector engagement; and iii) whole of society approach. Please provide this.

The description of problem mentions that climate change is accelerating deforestation. However, it doesn't provide any evidence or narrative on what climate hazards are driving deforestation and how. Reference text: "Climate change is accelerating a vicious cycle of landscape degradation and deforestation that is outpacing positive gains made in reforestation by the GoE". Please substantiate this further briefly. Also, it doesn't address the climate drivers of deforestation.

While we appreciate scaling up of an ongoing national program, the value that LDCF can bring is through innovation which the PIF lacks throughout. A strong baseline of GLI makes a strong case for the project to adopt innovative measures and build resilient systems which can have durable impacts. We recommend a strong focus on innovation in the project.

Finally, the project focuses only on forest conservation and forests based livelihoods. While it is understood that forest conservation and management can provide valuable ecosystem services which can improve resilience to potential impacts of climate change, we strongly recommend that the project includes adaptation activities that can support smallholder farmers and communities in adapting to the immediate climate change impacts of droughts and flooding. This will add value to the ongoing GLI program, else the LDCF will just be an additional fund to be added to the existing program. This includes supporting climate resilient production and value chain of crops which are vulnerable to climate and addressing drivers of deforestation which are described in the the PIF e.g. unsustainable agriculture, unplanned urban growth, etc. The PIF highlights food security challenges due to climate change and clearly mentions reduction in agriculture productivity as a direct impact of climate hazards. However, there is not much focus on activities that improve productivity and bring agriculture hectares under climate resilient management.

The combination of upstream activities related to forests management complemented by direct support on climate resilient agriculture will make the project more integrated addressing both urgent and future climate resilience.

December 7, 2023

The project design still lacks any innovative aspect. Using climate information to inform interventions is not an innovation rather than an essential aspect of any climate change adaptation project. Also, establishing a monitoring and reporting system is useful but not innovative. We expect innovation around governance, finance and specific adaptation solutions which the project still lacks. There is also scope for using digital technologies and remote sensing applications which can inform landscape planning by overlaying climate profile and other information.

We noted the text regarding alignment with the LDCF strategy. Only the whole of society approach aspect is strong in this project with the proposed multi stakeholder platform and focus on engaging local governments and stakeholders.

However, the scaling up of finance justification is very vague. It just indicates that the GLI will have more financing through the LDCF. This priority area aims to create enabling conditions in the countries which can support them leverage finance from public and private sources through innovative financing mechanisms, policy coherence to mobilize funds from various departments and creating tools and processes that can help better management of finance. We recommend including a component that can focus on financing in collaboration with financing institutions such as the FONERWA or others. This could include creating some incentive mechanisms or funding windows which can attract more finance.

Similarly, the innovation and technology transfer priority alignment has only one core logic which is integrating climate data in the second phase of the GLI. While this looks promising, we don't see any project component or outcome that will support this climate data generation and provide climate information services. We strongly recommend adding a component that will lead to provision or strengthening of climate information services and climate analytics that will inform the integration.

The examples of agriculture products are lacking and only indication is of NTFPs which do not necessarily address the agriculture related vulnerabilities identified in the project document.

GEFSEC December 8- thanks. The comments are cleared at the PIF stage.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Thank you, the gaps you have highlighted are well noted. Please see responses to specific points below:

Alignment with the three strategic priorities of GEF 8: Details have been added to the project summary as requested.

The description of the problem: The problem description in the project summary has been substantiated with additional information on how climate hazards are driving deforestation.

Innovation: Detail on the project's innovativeness has been added to the project summary and description Section B.

Climate-resilient agriculture and crop value chains: These have been further integrated into the project strategy with more focus being placed on climate-resilient agriculture and agricultural value chains under Outputs 3.1-3.3. This has also been highlighted in other areas of the project description.

Please note that partly as a result of broadened project scope, the number of districts targeted has been reduced from 6 to 12. The original core indicator targets have been maintained. The reduced number of target districts will allow for the full suite of adaptation interventions to be implemented in each of the districts, and will reduce the dispersion of efforts and mitigate the risk of related project management and coordination challenges.

08/12/2023

1. Innovativeness: The project's innovativeness rationale has been updated, with a focus on scaling-up finance for adaptation in the GLI, supporting the generation of locally specific data and climate information services to support climate change adaptation under the GLI, as well as the use of various data sets (including climate, remote sensing, land degradation and restoration suitability), digital and online technologies, etc, to inform agro-ecological landscape restoration and conservation, as well as livelihood planning under Components 2 and 3. Scaling up adaptation finance has been prioritised through the inclusion of a dedicated outcome (1.2) and output (1.2.1), while the generation of climate data and provision of climate information at the local level has been prioritised through the inclusion of Outcome 1.3 and Output 1.3.1. This information have been tracked across the various sections of the document as needed, to strengthen the relevant narratives.

2. Alignment with the LDCF strategy: details on how the project supports scaling up finance for adaptation have been updated based on the addition of a new outcome and output (Outcome 1.2 and Output 1.2.1). Please see additional detail on this that has been added across relevant sections of the document. Furthermore, the project's contribution to innovation, technology transfer and private sector engagement has also been updated.

3. Scaling up of adaptation finance: Regarding the scaling-up of adaptation finance, a new outcome (1.2. Adaptation finance scaled up within the GLI) and related output (1.2.1. GLI adaptation finance scaling-up mechanism and resource mobilization strategy) have been added to the to the project design. Please see the detailed description of Output 1.2.1 and updated ToC.

4. Climate data and information services: A new outcome (1.3 Enhanced climate resilience and adaptation benefits of GLI through the provision of tailored climate data and information services) and related output (1.3.1 climate data and information services to inform a climate-resilient GLI) have been added to the project design. Please see the detailed description of Output 1.3.1 and updated ToC.

5. Agricultural crops: An indicative list of agricultural crops that will be targeted under the project to address the agriculture-related vulnerabilities has been added.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

Please see the comments above.

Reference text "In the absence of intervention, climate change will continue to reduce the viability of traditional agricultural lifestyles, thereby accelerating the cycle of deforestation and land degradation which will ultimately lead to a further reduction in the delivery of critical ecosystem services and a decline in the climate-vulnerability of rural communities."

Please clarify how the project will support improved climate resilient agriculture practices so that future acceleration of deforestation and land degradation can be checked.

The project invests significantly in upstream forest restoration and conservation activities and appears more like a forest biodiversity project. Please clarify how the urgent adaptation needs of the rural communities in the downstream will be met from these activities. There is some reference to agroforestry but what about other crops which are essential for food security and livelihoods of communities, and perhaps are impacted by climate change. The agency is requested to address this in the project design.

As stated above, the potential contribution of this project to GLI phase 2 is well noted. However, this project has the opportunity to make this phase 2 more holistic going beyond plantation and agroforestry activities to make it more systematic with adaptation specific activities which include urgent adaptation needs of communities. Activities such as climate information services, water harvesting, climate resilient crop planning, other resilient livelihoods, building resilient assets, etc. could be considered.

A specific activity/component on climate change adaptation planning is recommended to be added to look beyond forestry planning and include a more cross sectoral approach covering forestry, agriculture and other land uses in the target regions.

Please clarify what is meant by "climate resilient GLI practices". The PIF doesn't provide any examples to explain this. Also, please elaborate how these practices will factor in climate information. Does climate data system exist in the target region at this local regional scale to inform restoration and conservation practices? If not, how will this data be sourced and how it will be applied.

Under output 1.2, the share of women 25% is very low. Please consider increasing to ensure gender parity.

While it is welcome to note the articulation of whole of society approach under the component 1, it lacks any direct engagement of civil society organizations.

Component 2: Please elaborate what is meant by "climate resilient restoration" and how it is different from conventional restoration approach. How will the impacts of climate change and any climate data be integrated under this? We also recommend using geospatial maps and satellite data to support planning of restoration activities that also overlays climate information (historic and projected) and economic activities which are influenced by climate change. In this component, please also elaborate how much of agriculture and other land use downstream will benefit from the forest conservation and management.

We very well noted the reference text "**The restoration protocols will be informed by climate projections and climate change vulnerability and risk assessments to ensure that the restored areas are resilient to ongoing and future climate changes.**" We recommend this to make this as a core activity under this component 2.1 and invest LDCF resources for this activity. This can then become model for future restoration and conservation activities. It is currently referred very lightly in the PIF. The project can collaborate with

technical and scientific institutions, civil society and other expert institutions to carry out this. Collaboration with the met department which did excellent work in a GEF 6 LDCF project, is strongly recommended.

Outcome 2.2- as discussed above, the project should look beyond forest based livelihood activities to downstream agriculture also to address production decline, food security and other urgent adaptation needs of smallholders.

Outcome 3: The PIF mentions that NTFPs are vulnerable to the impacts of climate change but at the same time proposes livelihoods based on NTFPs as adaptation solution. Please clarify how will the project enhance climate resilience of NTFPs. The PIF proposes to support bee keeping. Various scientific research indicates that climate change is leading to reduction in honey production. How will the project factor this and what will be the basis for selecting alternative livelihoods which are truly climate resilient? Outcome 3 has strong potential for private sector engagement which should be considered to leverage their market knowledge, innovation and financing.

7th December 2023

Climate resilient agriculture- the indicative example is only of climate resilient livelihoods through NTFPs. Please indicate what are the targeted crops and whether support will be provided for climate resilient crop planning.

Phase 2 innovation- we don't see any modification in the project design i.e. components, outcomes which can indicate innovation as a focus of this project. Please refer to the comment above.

Gender parity: The response is "Under Output 1.2, only 25% of development agents are women, so this target cannot be increased" Please explain why this can't be increased. The core indicators indicate 50%.

Please indicated where is the definition of "Climate Resilient Restoration" . We couldn't locate in the PIF.

GEFSEC December 8, 2023- thanks. comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

1. Climate-resilient agriculture: This has been further integrated into the project strategy with more focus being placed on climate-resilient agriculture under Output 3.1. The project's contribution to a shift towards climate-resilient agriculture has also been

highlighted in other areas of the project description and theory of change, including how it will reduce degradative productive practices that reduce the health of ecosystems that rural communities are reliant on for services that support climate resilience.

2. How adaptation needs of downstream communities will be met: Additional details on how the project addresses urgent adaptation needs of downstream communities, including food security, through climate-resilient agriculture, agricultural value chains, water harvesting and conservation measures, and nature-based livelihoods have been added to the project's intervention strategy, specifically the description of Output 3.1.

3. GLI phase 2 innovation: The project strategy has now been revised in line with these suggestions. Please see responses to relevant comments above.

4. Adaptation planning: Adaptation planning is included as an activity under Output 1.2. To ensure that capacity is built for integrated approaches to climate-resilient landscape restoration, cross-sectoral gender-inclusive training on the development and implementation of land use management, agricultural and natural resource plans will be undertaken, including training on and the support for the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation into these plans. The scope of these plans will be expanded on during the PPG phase once further analysis has been carried out.

5. Terminology: GLI best practices? - A definition of climate-resilient GLI best practices has been added in the Project Summary, as well as where it is first mentioned in the text (under Barrier 6).

6. Gender parity: Under Output 1.2, only 25% of development agents are women, so this target cannot be increased. However, the output formulation and description have been made more gender responsive: specific capacity-building activities will focus on the needs of female staff only, including dealing with SEAH in the office and field, The project will ensure that all of these women are accommodated and able to attend the trainings through scheduling and planning based on their needs.

7. Engagement with civil society: CSOs will be directly engaged via Output 1.3, supporting awareness raising and training amongst community cooperatives on the use of data to better understand climate change impacts and the identification of adaptation solutions, which will be carried out through relevant CSOs. Trainings will be designed to accommodate women, youths and marginalized groups, to promote gender equality and social inclusion (GESI), with support from relevant CSOs.

8. Terminology: Climate resilient restoration? - A description of climate resilient restoration? has been added in a footnote.

Integration of climate change/data: Climate change data will be used to inform restoration and forest management activities under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. Detailed restoration

plans and protocols will be developed during the PPG phase (including ecosystem mapping, species identification, maintenance needs, costs, etc.). The restoration protocols will be informed by climate projections and climate change vulnerability and risk assessments to ensure that the restored areas are resilient to ongoing and future climate changes and mitigate the impacts of associated hazards (such as droughts and floods).?

Details on how downstream land uses will benefit for restoration and conservation activities are included in the descriptions of Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

9. Restoration protocols: The development of protocols for restoration and landscape management based on climate change vulnerability and risk assessments and how this will be supported by partners such as the Ethiopian Meteorological Department amongst others has been elaborated on under the descriptions of Outputs 2.1 and 2.2. Specific activities related to this will be further developed during the PPG phase via consultations with relevant partners.

10. Downstream agriculture: Please see relevant responses above. Climate-resilient agriculture has been captured and elaborated on under Output 3.1.

11. NTFPs: The climate-resilience of NTFPs will be enhanced through the climate-resilient restoration and conservation of the forest landscapes that produces them under Component 2. To ensure that livelihoods promoted under Component 3 truly are climate resilient, a detailed list of livelihoods will be prepared through a gender-inclusive livelihoods needs assessment that will be undertaken during project development (PPG phase). The livelihoods needs assessment will be informed by climate change projections and vulnerability assessments, ensuring that climate change hazards (such as increasing droughts and floods) and the impacts thereof are addressed, promoting the selection of climate-resilient livelihoods (support provided by the National Meteorological Agency). This information is presented under the description of Output 3.1. Private sector engagement will be maximised through Outputs 3.2 and 3.3

08/12/2023

1. Climate resilient agriculture: An indicative list of targeted crops has been added to the Output, as well as information on support for climate resilient crop planning and farming practices.

2. Innovation: please see responses above and edits in the PIF.

3. Gender parity: Regarding 1.1.2, gender inclusiveness of trainings have been updated to reflect that all female staff in the relevant governmental institutions/departments will be trained (100% of female staff in the departments) to ensure that women are prioritised. The project will ensure that all of these women are accommodated and able to attend the trainings through scheduling and planning based on their needs.

4. Definition of climate-resilient restoration: see footnotes 116 and 120.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Gender integration is relatively weak across all the components. There is some reference to building capacity of 25% of women participants. At the big picture level, the PIF misses to articulate their specific vulnerabilities and how the proposed solutions will address them.

Knowledge management is fine.

December 7- this is fine now.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Across the PIF, gender has now been integrated more fully into all aspects of the project, including the project strategy. Additional contextual information has been added to the baseline analysis to elaborate on the specific effects of baseline problems (drivers of vulnerability) on women, and more information has been added to describe specific climate impacts on women. Additionally, gender targets have been revised across the PIF, making them more ambitious.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

The agency is requested to consider the following activities with funding allocation in either component 2 or 3 to make the project more effective in addressing urgent adaptation needs and better integration of climate data.

- A component/activity to support integrated adaptation planning at landscape scale covering forests and agriculture land uses.

- Interventions that support adaptation in the agriculture sector targeting loss of productivity due to climate hazards and food security issues. This could include support

for climate resilient production practices, water management, climate information systems, market linkages, etc.

- Emphasize on developing tools and risk analysis that support climate data and vulnerability assessments to inform restoration, conservation, resilient agriculture and alternative livelihood activities.

December 7- As the project proposes to scale up financing, we suggest adding an outcome around financing. Please refer to comment above regarding financing. Regarding climate and weather data, while it is well noted the projections will be considered in planning, how will the project ensure climate and weather information services are delivered that can strengthen climate informed production and market linkages. Are there weather stations existing to provide such critical services?

GEFSEC December 8, 2023- Thanks. Comments cleared. Some of the elements will be reviewed again the CEO ER stage.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

1. Integrated adaptation planning at landscape scale: Adaptation planning is included as an activity under Output 1.2. To ensure that capacity is built for integrated approaches to climate-resilient landscape restoration, cross-sectoral gender-inclusive training on the development and implementation of land use management, agricultural and natural resource plans will be undertaken, including training on and the support for the mainstreaming of climate change adaptation into these plans. The scope of these plans will be expanded on during the PPG phase once further analysis has been carried out.

2. Adaptation in the agriculture sector targeting loss of productivity: This has been further integrated into the project strategy with more focus being placed on climate-resilient agriculture under Output 3.1. The project's contribution to a shift towards climate-resilient agriculture has also been highlighted in other areas of the project description and theory of change, including how it will reduce degradative productive practices that reduce the health of ecosystems that rural communities are reliant on for services that support climate resilience.

3. Developing tools and risk analysis: Climate change data will be used to inform restoration and forest management activities under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. Detailed restoration plans and protocols will be developed during the PPG phase (including ecosystem mapping, species identification, maintenance needs, costs, etc.). The restoration protocols will be informed by climate projections and climate change vulnerability and risk assessments to ensure that the restored areas are resilient to ongoing and future climate changes and mitigate the impacts of associated hazards (such as droughts and floods). To ensure that livelihoods promoted under Component 3 truly are climate

resilient, a detailed list of livelihoods will be prepared through a gender-inclusive livelihoods needs assessment that will be undertaken during project development (PPG phase). The livelihoods needs assessment will be informed by climate change projections and vulnerability assessments, ensuring that climate change hazards (such as increasing droughts and floods) and the impacts thereof are addressed, promoting the selection of climate-resilient livelihoods (support provided by the National Meteorological Agency). This information is presented under the description of Output 3.1.

08/12/2023

Scaling up adaptation financing and climate information services: please see above responses.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

Please refer to comments above.

The barriers section is very well described. However, the project design doesn't clearly respond to those barriers.

For example

Barrier 1: Institutional capacity- Although the GoE has invested heavily in environmental protection, institutional capacity at national, sub-national and local levels to plan and execute climate-resilient landscape restoration remains limited.

This barrier clearly says that there is lack of capacity to factor in climate resilience. The project design however appears to just advance the environmental protection rather than investing in the climate integration aspect primarily.

Barrier 3, articulates issues related to lack of enabling environment for private sector investment in adaptation. However, it is not clear which specific intervention will address this barrier.

December 7- Ok.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Well noted. Additional linkages to how the project specifically addressed each barrier have been added to the project description (output narratives).

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

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

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

For a and b please refer to comments above.

c) is fine.

d) We recommend strong engagement of Ethiopian Meteorological Institute in the project for effectively integrating climate and weather data in the adaptation planning and interventions. Also, role of CSOs and private sector can be strengthened in the project.

December 7- Regarding EMI, the role and description is inconsistent. The description indicates that they will be engaged only in the project development. See text below from the PIF

During the full project development, NMA will be engaged to effectively integrate climate and weather data in the adaptation planning and interventions.

We are recommending a strong implementation role with responsibility of delivering climate and data and analytics related deliverables. We heard about their successful work in the GEF 5 project which was showcased in the recent regional workshop in Ethiopia. It will be a missed opportunity to engage them only in a very light touch upstream stage. Please make their role more central.

GEFSEC December 8, 2023- Thanks. No more comments.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

a) and b) As noted, the previous comments have been addressed and the text revised in line with the suggested direction.

d) The National Meteorological Agency has now been explicitly mentioned in the text as a potential partner for project development and implementation. During the full project development, their role will be assessed in more detail and they will be consulted to support the development of activities related to integrating climate and weather data into adaptation planning and relevant interventions (including climate-resilient restoration, forest conservation and livelihoods). Private sector engagement will be maximised through Outputs 3.2 and 3.3 ? see relevant edits highlighting the envisaged role of the private sector. CSOs will be directly engaged via Output 1.3, supporting awareness raising and training amongst community cooperatives on the use of data to better understand climate change impacts and the identification of adaptation solutions, which will be carried out through relevant CSOs. Trainings will be designed to accommodate women, youths and marginalized groups, to promote gender equality and social inclusion (GESI), with support from relevant CSOs. Please see relevant responses above.

08/12/2023

Role of NMI: NMI has been included as an implementing partner under several outputs (1.3.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1 and 3.1.1). NMI will let the implementation of Output 1.3.1 (Climate data and information services to inform a climate-resilient GLI). NMI's role as implementing partner has also been highlight under the Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects subsection (page 12).

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

Please refer to the comments above.

In the TOC, please start with the climate change hazards and problems, then link the barriers, followed by input activities, outputs, outcomes and impact. The TOC doesn't necessarily have to be layout showing all the outputs and outcomes of the project. it could be a simple diagram showing the pathway of change.

December 7- OK

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

A more simplified version of the ToC has been developed as requested.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

Please refer to the comments above. Addressing those comments will strengthen the incremental cost reasoning. The project has big scope to enhancing adaptation rationale and bringing in innovation aspect in the project to complement the successful GLI program of Ethiopian Government.

December 7- The innovation aspect is still weak. Further, as mentioned above, given that the project is building on a strong baseline of an ongoing initiative and a strong institutional readiness, the project should create enabling conditions to not only support specific adaptation solutions, but support on scaling up financing for adaptation. Please refer to some suggestions provided earlier.

December 8- cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Please see responses to above comments and the revised PIF.

08/12/2023

Innovation: Please see above responses.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

Kindly provide a project coordination and governance approach in the PIF. This can be provided under the section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project."

December 7- Ok

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

A brief project coordination and governance structure has been presented as requested. This will be detailed further via a consultative process during the PPG phase.

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Please clarify why women beneficiaries are only 40%. We strongly recommend at least 50% target beneficiaries as women and project interventions should include activities that can support this target.

Core indicator 4 is different from core indicator 1. It seems same beneficiaries are being targeted in both. CI 4 is related to capacity building of government officials and local level representatives from governments, civil society, community groups and private sector for effective climate adaptation decision making. CI 1 are beneficiaries who will benefit from on-ground project interventions, policies, plans and other decisions.

December 7, 2023

OK.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

1. Women beneficiaries: The target of 40% women beneficiaries was based on past experiences of implementing initiatives in rural areas of Ethiopia by the EFD ? this was a recommendation. However, this has now been increased to 50% to make sure that the proposed project is more ambitious than and improves on past initiatives in terms of gender equality.
2. Core indicators: Well noted. The target for CI 4 has been revised to 3,260.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) **Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**
- b) **Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) **Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) **Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**
- c) **Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

The project lacks innovation. Please add.

For being truly transformative, please refer to the comment regarding addressing urgent adaptation priorities related to the agriculture sector and climate integration in restoration and conservation activities.

December 7: Please see comments above regarding innovation which is largely due to a strong baseline that exists in Ethiopia.

Cleared now

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Innovativeness: Detail on the project's innovativeness has been added to the project summary and description Section B. The core avenue of project innovation is climate-proofing interventions under the GLI's second phase and ensuring that they are selected and designed to maximise adaptation benefits of the initiative. This will be achieved through a diverse approach to building vertical and horizontal capacity and coordination for EbA within the GLI, including transforming approaches to community forest management (CFM) to ensure that they consider climate change scenarios and appropriate responses. Furthermore, the sustainable management and restoration of forest landscapes, as well as introduced livelihoods that are dependent on them, will be informed by climate projections and climate change vulnerability and risk assessments to ensure that they are resilient to ongoing and future climate changes and mitigate the impacts of associated hazards. In addition, the interventions will be selected and designed with the aim of fully realizing their potential to provide adaptation benefits to communities. A final innovation of the project that will support the climate-resilient transformation of forest and agro-ecological landscape management under the GLI is the establishment of a long-term monitoring, evaluation and reporting system, which will allow approaches to pivot based on successes or failures, as well as for scaling up and replication to take place across the country.

Transformative approach: please refer to relevant responses above.

08/12/2023

Innovation: Please see above responses.

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

Please elaborate the alignment more. Currently, the relevant PIF section just lists the priorities.

December 7- please comments above regarding this.

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

The project's alignment with the GEF programming strategy has now been elaborated in more detail as requested.

08/12/2023

Please see above responses.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

The project has the potential to generate BD benefits. The agency is recommended to articulate BD benefits as per this question.

OK

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Additional information has been added under Section C to describe the proposed project's alignment with the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Please address the following comments from PPO:

PPO comments:

1. Letter of Endorsement: the template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate". Per the attached email back in March when we were aiming to constitute June 2023 Work Program, Agencies were informed that LoEs "with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

2. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$64,250,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,212,500 instead of \$1,250,000 (which is 1.9%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

3. Gender: Fully agree and support PM's comment. In addition, Agency should note that integrating gender perspectives in projects goes beyond targeting women as beneficiaries; it means understanding gender inequalities as they relate to the project and target community/ies and designing project outputs and activities that address the identified inequalities. Please ensure to develop a Gender Action Plan that is budgeted and to monitor and report on gender-specific results.

4. Stakeholder engagement: Agree with PM's comment that the role of CSOs and private sector can be strengthened in the project. In addition, the agency states that it has consulted civil society organizations and IPLCs but a list of these have not provided. Agency should provide the list of these stakeholders that have been consulted and elaborate further also on their respective role

related to project outcomes.

5. Environmental and social safeguards: The project overall ESS risk is classified as low and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). However, the SRIF does not identify any potential social risk related to the shift towards more sustainable practices in natural resources management, which could lead to conflicts among communities and stakeholder groups or exacerbation of existing conflicts and disputes over access to resources and preferred land uses without further stakeholder analysis and engagement plan. The project also failed to recognize potential risk that vulnerable/marginalized stakeholder groups might be excluded or not meaningfully engaged in the process of forest and agricultural landscape management. 1) Please elaborate further related these potential social risks and provide plans for further assessment and management plan during the PPG with clear budget and timeline.

The project recognized climate change risk as moderate. 2) Please include climate change risk assessment plan during the PPG.

In addition, the attached SRIF does not include any review by the safeguard team. 3) please include their safeguard review and review summary in the SRIF.

GEFSEC 7 December: Thanks. Looks fine. To be further reviewed by the PPO.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

1. Letter of endorsement: An email from GEF OFP confirming the acceptance of the footnote as part of the LOE has been provided as requested.
2. PMC proportionality: The proportionality of the co-finance contribution to PMC has been amended accordingly.
3. Gender: Gender-related information has now been integrated across the PIF, including in the background and context sections (in the problem analysis, under underlying and root causes, as well as in the section on climate impacts). The ToC has also been strengthened in line with the request and suggestions for further integration of gender. During the full project development (PPG) stage, a fully budgeted Gender Action Plan will be developed.
4. Stakeholder engagement: Although CSO and IPLC engagement was not extensive during the development of the PIF, the project team's field visits to Hadho Kebele in Bati District in October 2023 included consultations with local community members, as well as members of the area's watershed management committee. The perspectives of these individuals and groups have been incorporated into the revised version of the PIF,

including an elaboration of their climate vulnerabilities, initiatives they are involved in and their potential role in the project strategy. During the PPG phase, more extensive CSO and community consultations will be held and their role in the project elaborated.

5. ESS: Thank you for raising this important potential set of risks. These have been captured in the SRIF under Safeguard Standard 6, risk factor 6.3. During full project development these and other potential social and environmental risks will be further assessed and mitigation measures identified

A climate risk assessment plan will be included during the PPG as requested.

The SRIF has now been reviewed by UNEP's safeguards team and their review has been included in the submission.

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

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments
8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments
23 million USD recurrent expenditure as co-financing from beneficiaries doesn't align well with the project in absence of a clear elaboration. We suggest removing at the PIF stage and revisit this at CEO ER stage if approved by the Council. Please elaborate the GCF co-financing.

Thanks- Ok

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Co-financing: Well noted. The USD 23 million recurrent expenditure co-financing has been removed and will be re-evaluated for inclusion during the PPG phase. GCF co-financing has been elaborated on in the PIF with details of the proposed GCF-financed project added.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

The project has significant BD and LD relevance , and in the current version they are more strongly targeted than CCA. Please tag their Rio Markers accordingly.

Thanks.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

Rio Markers: Thank you. The Rio Markers have been updated accordingly.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

Not yet. The agency is requested to address technical and policy comments provided by the PPO.

Please address a few additional comments and resubmit the project.

Yes-

GEFSEC 12 December

Please address the following comment and resubmit the PIF.

Stakeholder engagement : The project has not provided additional information opportunities to strengthen the role of CSO's and the Private sector. Considering the focus on this project to enhance the climate resilience of smallholder farmers, the project should provide some additional details on how it plans to consult and engage these key project stakeholders in project development.

GEFSEC 12th December

Thanks. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

05/12/2023

All technical and policy comments in the document have now been addressed.

08/12/2023

All additional comments have been addressed.

12/12/2023

Additional information has been provided under 'Stakeholder Engagement' in Section D on the plans for consulting and engaging CSOs and the private sector in project development, to strengthen their role in the project. Furthermore, additional information on the roles of CSOs and the private sector in the implementation of the project has been added in Section A, in the table on 'Relevant stakeholders and their roles in the project'.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	11/1/2023	12/5/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/9/2023	12/8/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/7/2023	12/12/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/12/2023	