



Resilience for Peace & Stability, Food and Water Security Innovation Grant Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10430

Countries

Global

Project Name

Resilience for Peace & Stability, Food and Water Security Innovation Grant Program

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

8/6/2021

Review completed by PM

11/1/2021

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

If the project duration is 36 months, the expected completion date should be 3/1/2025 ?
please clarify and amend

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Yes

Agency Response

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: Well noted. The project duration is 30 months (two and a half years). This has been amended in the system.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19August2021:

Yes

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Noted and cleared.

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Co-financing: Unable to locate the UNDP co-financing letter (in-kind). Please upload the letter in the Portal.

GEFSEC 1Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7October2021:

The relationship between Stockholm University and GRP is well noted.

As indicated above, please explain the significant changes of co-financing between the PIF and CER, and any corresponding implications on the overall project scope and impacts.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Please explain the significant changes of co-financing between the PIF and CER, and any corresponding implications on the overall project scope and impacts.

We notice \$810,950 in in-kind co-financing is indicated as coming from Stockholm University, but the letter from this amount is from the Global Resilience Partnership. Please either correct the name of the co-financier indicated in the CER, provide a letter from Stockholm University, and/or explain the relationship between GRP and Stockholm University in the co-financing letter.

Agency Response

The co-financing will come from Stockholm University, which is the host of the Global Resilience Partnership.

29 Oct 2021

The original co-financing outlined in the PIF has been reduced due to the significant declines to SIDA's budget as a result of the COVID19 pandemic. GRP is now heavily investing in-kind resources in the project to bolster co-financing. In addition, UNDP policy does not allow pre-selection of low value grant grantees; therefore the co-finance from shortlisted local partners cannot be counted as co-finance. It is expected that there will be significant additional co-financing from the grantees as part of the grant selection criteria, and this will be reported to GEF once the selection process is completed.

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: Unfortunately, we are unable to secure the Agency co-finance at this stage. Therefore, UNDP co-finance has been removed from the documents.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 1Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7October2021:

Please provide a breakdown of the Equipment description of "Admin, rent and equipment- GRP support services to the local partners for financial services, HR procurement and travel services". Also, we note admin , rent and "GRP support services to the local partners for financial services, HR, procurement and travel services" are not equipment. Please detail and revise accordingly.

Why is \$50,000 for a consultant included as a "grant" expense? We suggest placing this amount under consultants?

Please indicate the daily rate for all consultants.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Please provide this budget table in the relevant format and clearly titled.

Agency Response

Noted, please see the revised version.

29 Oct 2021

Well noted, there are no equipment for this item. It is mostly cost related to admin and planned support services to the local partners. The budget has been adjusted to accommodate for two countries instead of three. The grants are now \$200,000 and \$300,000 respectively. The consultant expense in the grant selection has been removed. The budget has been adjusted to accommodate for additional research, more funding has been allocated to workshops and for the PMU to travel to the projects, and M&E has been increased. The reason to change to two countries is explained in detail under section below.

All consultants? daily rate is now added in the budget note.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 7October2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 19August2021:

No. Please provide.

Agency Response Noted, now it has been uploaded Annex C in the system.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 19August2021:

We note with appreciation the increase of hectares and people trained. However, we also note with concern the decrease in total number of beneficiaries. Please seek opportunities to maintain this total figure at 20,000 as indicated in the PIF.

Agency Response Thank you for your comment. We would like to keep the total beneficiary number at 15800 given a few sources of uncertainty, but we remain committed to updating it upward during the implementation whenever it becomes possible. The following presents a few areas of interventions where we are using conservative estimates for the time being, but areas of expansion are already identified once the initial pilot interventions are successful. For Fonkoze, we currently count 400 beneficiaries from an initial pilot product as the direct beneficiaries, but once the product is deemed successful, it will be rolled out to all Fonkoze's network branches and up to 4,000 beneficiaries would be added. For the LWR project, members of existing 150 farmer are counted as direct beneficiaries, but an additional 8,000 farmers have already been identified and their readiness assessed as the second group to benefit. Once these expansions are made based on the successes of the initial pilots, it is expected that the beneficiaries would be expanded to over 25,000, and this will be communicated during implementation.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 19August2021:

We note the core risks referenced that interlink between climate change and state fragility have been reduced from 7 in the PIF to 3 in the CER. Please explain why.

We also note the image describing the relationships between violence, justice, institutions, economic foundations, and resilience has also been removed. Please explain

why, and if these points are no longer relevant to the project, why this is the case. Alternatively/additionally, please included the relevant points from the PIF in the CER.

With regards to the focus country selections, only brief reference is made to the conflict context in each of the 3 focus countries, and particularly Uganda for which very little mention is made on conflict aspects. Please expand on this. In doing so, please explain why and how this is a valuable piloting and learning reference in conflict contexts through this project particularly in Uganda.

Agency Response These were removed to make the proposal more concise; we have now added these back in the CER page 4. Additional conflict information is added for each country under 'Country-fragility and climate risk' section CER page 6. As the OFPs have requested to see the FP, we are trying to be careful with how detailed we describe the conflicts.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 19August2021:

We note that text related to the baseline has not been included in the CER that was in the PIF and may still be relevant, including as it relates to GRP and UNDP previous and ongoing programming. Please maintain any relevant related information from the PIF to the CER.

Agency Response Noted, we have added this information back in the CER under section 'the baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects' page 7.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 19August2021:

The description of 3 key barriers is well noted. However, particularly for the first two barriers, please substantively expand on how these challenges are unique and/or exacerbated given the conflict contexts in the focus countries, as opposed to in LDCs contexts more broadly.

Agency Response

Noted, additional information on the conflict angel has been added in CER under the section "Problem statement", page 12 & 13.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

CCA Core Indicators: Please fill Core Indicator table and edit Annex A 'Project Results Framework' (it seems to be poorly copy-pasted) ? reflecting GEF Core Indicators and their targets in both.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: Well noted, there was a version control error, this has been updated.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

Please upload the map and geo-referenced information directly into the CER document.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

No. In the annex of the CER, please provided a map indicating targeting regions/countries required at the PIF stage.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Detail project areas will be selected during PPG stage based on risk and vulnerability assessment. All regions and potential targeted countries listed in figure 1 and Table 1 fit the board criteria of fragility and climate change. Specific criteria for investment will be developed during the PPG stage. Criteria will reflect GRP and UNDP in-country partner strength ? specifically the ability of partners to understand the local context of food and water security interventions and the viability of community, government and market institutions to support innovation and entrepreneurship in this space. Criteria for assessment will be framed by the potential investment?s contribution to resilient water and food systems and more specifically along the lines of: innovativeness, gender considerations, scalability, team competition, viability and risk.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

This has been provided. The focal regions will be the Sahel, Horn of Africa and South Asia. Please note that the countries highlighted in red on the map provided will be properly scoped during the PPG Stage. We have picked these countries because they all leverage the in-country partner strength of GRP and UNDP and they are all fragile and/or conflict prone.

9 SEP 2021

Noted. This has been uploaded in a separate file.

29 Oct 2021

Noted. This has been added to section ?1b. Project Map and Geo-Coordinates.?

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the**

implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Stakeholder engagement: The submission indicates that the project has not included any stakeholder groups, but it does not include a justification why not. Please provide further clarification and also more clearly indicate what role civil society will play in the project implementation.

GEFSEC 1Nov2012:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

Please include this information directly in the CEO Approval Request document.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Please explain the nature of consultations with specific stakeholders in the three target countries, during the project preparation phase. In doing so, please expand on the nature of consultations and stakeholders with women and women entrepreneurs public or private entities.

As requested in the CER template, please provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Agency Response

Thank you. This has been added in a separate document with a detailed summary on the timing of engagement and information collection.

29 Oct 2021

Noted. This has been updated under section ?2. Stakeholders.?

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: This project is a full CSOs implementation. The executing entity GRP is a CSO, the two local implementing partners (shortlisted) are both CSOs. They are shortlisted from a competitive process of GRP that has engaged 70+ CSOs/NGOs globally in the least developed countries. This has been detailed in the section 2. Stakeholders of the CEO endorsement document. Once approved by the project board, the local partners will be implementing the project together with GRP on the ground. The local stakeholders have also been consulted, listed under Annex 9 - Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Gender: The submission includes a gender action plan, but it is somewhat unclear if a gender analysis has been carried out. Please clarify further.

GEFSEC 7October:

Technically cleared for the time being, pending further review for policy considerations.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Please explicitly indicate if the gender analysis been completed and if it identified any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities.

Agency Response

No gender analysis has been conducted as on-ground partners are only shortlisted. Stakeholder consultations during the project design have resulted in the development of a Gender Action Plan. The plan will guide on-ground partners to conduct two pilot adaptation innovation studies in conflict-prone regions that account for gender empowerment to identify and acknowledge gender differences, gaps and opportunities

and to ensure that women's empowerment objective is simultaneously achieved along with the project objective. Shortlisted partners have also committed to ensuring at least 50% of women who will adopt new 'climate resilience' products and improve beneficiaries' access to finance with at least 50% women beneficiaries, directly linked to project output targets.

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: Gender action plan and analysis is completed. Please see Annex 10 Gender Analysis and Action Plan. In the document, we have also highlighted that a detailed gender analysis will be conducted during the incipient phase of project implementation in line with UNDP gender policy.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 1November2021:

The focusing of the projects on Sudan and Uganda is well noted. PM confirms all reasonable efforts have been made by both the Agency and the GEF Secretariat to reach the OFP of Haiti on October 11, 2021, in effort to confirm if they are still interested in receiving this project support in their country. The OFP of Haiti has not indicated interest.

GEFSEC 7Oct2021:

We appreciate the challenges being experienced in Haiti. Please provide an update on the status and anticipated timing. Alternatively, given the timeline for approval, alternatives may need to be considered.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

We note an OFP Endorsement Letter has not been provided from any of the relevant OFPs. Please provide.

Agency Response

Yes, as the recently natural disasters and political changes continuing in Haiti, we are working with the OFP to obtain the endorsement letter.

29 Oct 2021

Despite several attempts at obtaining a letter of endorsement from the local Haitian authorities we were not successful due to the local challenges buffeting the country. This does not present a significant change to the project as the objective, outcomes and outputs for the project are unchanged. The planned grant funding to the shortlisted

partner in Haiti will be reallocated to the existing two shortlisted partners in Sudan and Uganda. In fact, the impact is actually higher, moving from a previously intended 15,800 direct beneficiaries to a now intended 22,000 beneficiaries, area of land managed for climate resilience also aimed to increase from 46,000 ha to 69,000 ha.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Knowledge management: We note that the knowledge management activities are part of the Component 3. However, budget information for knowledge management activities is not clear in the budget table. Please provide budget information with timeline for the knowledge management activities.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: This has been updated in the budget table under row 13 in ProDpc, including the consultants' cost (and estimated timeline) for knowledge management. The project results will be shared yearly during the Gobeshona Global Conference for locally-led action and other key international events. The GEF Budget and notes have also been updated accordingly.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 1 November 2021:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 7 October 2021:

We note \$5,000 is charged for an inception workshop under the M and E plan, as well as under the main project budget. Please clarify if this amount is being charged twice, or if the total cost of the inception workshop is \$10,000, or otherwise, and/or revise accordingly.

GEFSEC 19 August 2021:

Unknown, until the detailed budget is submitted.

Agency Response

We have submitted the budget and M&E plan in the ROADMAP name: Project M&E plan

29 Oct 2021

Well noted, additional clarification has been provided in the budget; \$5,000 is costed for the planned M&E session of the inception workshop. There is an additional cost of \$10,000 planned for the after the inception workshop for an on-boarding technical workshop for the grantees, with a focus on safeguard training, explore current climate risks in their region and how it is related to potential resource conflict and conduct conflict sensitive development training.

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 19 August 2021:

As requested at the time of PIF approval, please briefly and explicitly outline how the project may contribute to economic recovery from the Pandemic and integrate with broader rebuilding efforts.

Agency Response

Noted. This has been added to the CER under section ?10. Benefits.? Page 36.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Audit should be charged under PMC but not under M&E budget.

Office supplies can be charged to PMC but not to project component.

Please indicate the M&E budget allocation in the budget table, as shown under point 2 above, M&E column is zero.

GEFSEC 7October2021:

Cleared

GEFSEC 19August2021:

No. As commented above, please complete Annex C on Status of Utilization of PPG, Annex D on Maps and Coordinates, and Annex E on Project Budget.

Agency Response

Noted, please see these annexes in this round of submission.

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: Well noted, this has been updated under the new budget table.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Cleared

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 9Nov2021:

The further comments are technically cleared.

GEFSEC 5Nov2021:

Please address the further policy oriented comments provided.

GEFSEC 1November2021:

This CER approval is technically cleared.

GEFSEC 7October2021:

Please address the comments provided above and resubmit, including with regards to the Letter of Endorsement from the OFP of Haiti.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Please address the comments provided above and resubmit.

Agency Response

29 Oct 2021

all comments are addressed as per above.

UNDP, 9 Nov 2021: All comments are addressed as per above.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 7October2021:

Yes. This CEO endorsement request is technically cleared by the PM.

GEFSEC 19August2021:

Not yet.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/19/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

11/9/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations