GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Home RoadMap

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

Review PIF 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

11/11/2019

Review completed by PM

6/9/2020

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, 15 November 2019

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, 15 November 2019

A crucial innovative dimension the original concept was its focus on peace, stability and conflict-prone regions, in addition to the more general notion of "fragile regions". As the project title suggests, it is important to strengthen the focus beyond just fragile regions, to peace, stability and conflict-prone regions throughout the PIF. The project will be strengthened with more specific clarification of how it will foster peace and stability in conflict-prone regions through investment in catalyzing private sector action and finance to address climate change. Referring to "conflict-prone regions" more often, as well as peace and stability beyond the title, will be useful.

Please ensure building on GRP, UNDP and others' important work in identifying and assessing potential innovations for enterprises to strengthen climate resilience in fragile and conflict-prone regions. Much important work has already been done in this area. We suggest current output 1.1 be cut or greatly reduced to focus resources on investing in building on this base and ongoing work by UNDP, GRP and others.

Output 1.2 seems to be missing some text after "fragile". Is this meant to be fragile and conflict-prone regions?

Please specify what is meant by "partnerships crowded in to catalyze investment" (output 1.3), both in table B and the following descriptive sections (e.g. Partnerships with who and to do what? How will these partnerships be achieved and what will they produce?). In doing so, please clarify the intended impact. If these will be partnerships with IFIs, commercial banks, regional and/or national development banks, this is certainly positive and we encourage this focus. However, we encourage consideration of this to be part of an expanded component 2 or a new component 3 focused on catalyzing private investment.

As discussed previously, how specifically is this more innovative than providing grant funding to NGOs and CSOs, and how will it directly catalyze private sector for climate resilience and peace in conflict-prone settings? To this end, please revise output 2.2 to include focus of investments in adaptation-oriented businesses, and not just NGOs and CSOs, which however important may better be the focus of a different project and funding source. Please note that as indicated in the Call for Proposals criteria D, focus and impact on “catalyzing private sector for climate change adaptation at scale” is a requirement for all projects under this Challenge Program.

Please ensure the total $ value of the set of smaller scale (10-40k investments) is greater than or at least equal to the value of the larger 100k investments, with a view to achieving breadth of impact, especially given the number of enterprises financed is low. To accelerate the most promising enterprises, we strongly encourage explicit investment matchmaking oriented activities (potentially under a new or at least expanded outcome), and we are hopeful this is what was meant by the general reference to "crowding in" partnerships to catalyze investment.

As also discussed previously, we encourage identifying a way to provide the grant investments on a repayable and rotating basis. Revolving repayable grants will better enable financial sustainability of the fund, innovation of the enterprises supported, and avoid crowding out the higher number of competitor enterprises who don't get grants. This is especially important given the STAP's comments on innovation and private engagement lacking. The specifics of such a revolving fund can be detailed during the PPG stage, but we encourage identifying options for at least a portion of the grant to take this approach. In close consultation with GEF Secretariat policy colleagues, please consider the following guidance that it is possible to incorporate and capitalize a revolving fund in this project, and how this can be reflected in the PIF stage, and then later at the project preparation stage: By the time of CEO Endorsement, the GEF Implementing Agency (UNDP) will need to present: (i) a detailed explanation of the mechanism through which the Executing Entities will select the grant proposals and disburse the funds; (ii) how GEF Implementing Agency (UNDP) will ensure that the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements are met by each one of the Executing Entities at all levels of the project implementation; and (iii) a legal establishment/mechanism on how the GEF fund is transferred to set up revolving funds, and how the new fund is to be operated with outflows/inflows of loans and credits if any. Please consider how to build this into the PIF, as doing so would help address some of the STAP concerns about lack of innovation. We will be glad to discuss this further, if you like.

GEFSEC January 22 2020

We appreciate the response provided and revisions made based on these comments. However, recalling STAP's comment about the lack of innovation in this project, the GEF Secretariat sees opportunities to strengthen innovation in this project in two key aspects: (A) Innovation in the use of GEF finance to create financial reflow and sustainability for investing in enterprises over time; and (B) Innovation from the specific investments made in the enterprises benefiting from the project.

With regards to (A), we note the response that UNDP cannot use revolving fund or revolving facility as a financial instrument. However, it is also important to note that other GEF Agencies are able to do so. At least two other GEF Agencies are planning to use revolving funds with resources made available through this Challenge Program, and it is unfortunate that UNDP is unable to operate with this useful innovation strategy. We strongly encourage considering other options for enabling financial reflow for sustainability of this innovation program, such as zero interest loans to enterprise owners and/or a form of guarantees to financial intermediaries (e.g. GRP, commercial banks, regional or national development banks, non-profits providing micro-finance, etc.). This latter approach of grants forming the basis of a guarantee for a commercial lender is planned by another GEF Agency with is a UN partner, and is a strong example of innovation for program sustainability.

With regards to "(B) What aspects of 'innovation' will be achieved by the enterprises", we referred to the innovation criteria listed in the PIF. The criteria listed do not provide a clear idea of what innovation aspects the project will consider in making funding decision. For example, "degree of innovation" as a criteria is overly vague.

Other criteria listed are also more related to sustainability. While innovation is inherent to these criteria, a better articulation of innovative aspects linking with the systemic barriers identified in the PIF will strengthen the project design.

May 18, 2020

GEFSEC 18May2020:

On Comment A - We understand that all nodes will manage the funds they receive through this project in such a way that strives to receive a significant portion of re-flow of the capital they provide to entrepreneurs, thereby providing financial innovation and increasing financial sustainability of the investment made. Please clarify if this is not the case. Related, we note the risk specified in the table in section II, sub section 5, indicated as medium risk for "Risk of low rates of repayment", as well as the risk management measures that will be in place.

On B- We note the theoretical description of what is meant in this PIF by innovation. However, the PIF provides only preliminary explanation of the specific innovative approaches that will be deployed through the activities of this project. Therefore, prior to CEO approval, further explanation will be required of the set of specific innovative approaches that will be piloted and tested through this project. This further description of innovation in this project must include specification of the approaches being deployed to address climate impacts that have either not been used before to address the specified climate adaptation related challenge, and/or have not been used before in the project area.

Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, we would like the project to factor in the situation and propose

1. Measures the project will take to minimize risks to project implementation cause by COVID-19; and
2. How the project may contribute to economic recovery from the Pandemic and integrate with broader rebuilding efforts

GEFSEC 9June2020:

Cleared as sufficient at the PIF stage. However, prior to CEO approval it will be necessary to fully incorporate and expand on explanations related to the repayment instruments (point A); innovation (point B), and Covid referenced in your response.

GEFSEC 1July2020: In addition to the points below, please note that by CEO Endorsement, a detailed explanation will be required of the mechanism through which the Executing Entity (Global Resilience Partnership) will select the small business, disburse the funds and manage the reflows (if any).

GEFSEC 13July2020: Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)
We have added additional information on the importance of catalyzing investment in food and water security as a pathway to peace and stability in conflict-prone regions. The project is also redesigned to be a lot more private sector focused. We have also adjusted the text to ensure that conflict prone occurs throughout.

Output 1.1 budget has been reduced according to suggestion. UNDP and GRP have extensive experience with climate analysis, understanding the climate risks and fragile setting of conflict-prone regions with high climate vulnerability. However, private sector development and potential adaptation focused businesses in this context has rarely been studied and researched; is also necessary to gather market intelligence around capital providers and supply chain actors in the target areas to unlock scale-up potential for the investments that will be addressed under the component 2. This market intelligence research is also key for investment matchmaking activities.

Output 1.2 has been modified accordingly in response to the comments.

Output 1.3 has been moved to 3.2. Information around local MFIs, credit unions, commercial banks, national development banks and supply chain actors in the project area will be gathered through component 1. Output 3.2 has been changed to specifically catalyze private investment by providing promising enterprises with investment matchmaking support to these capital providers and supply chain actors.

Adjustments made for the investment to focus on the private sector with 70% of the funding allocation, social enterprises will receive 30% of the funding allocation. All investments will be $40,000. With regards to revolving fund, based on UNDP FRR, UNDP cannot use revolving fund or revolving facility.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

Thank you for the comments regarding B – aspects of innovation. We have better articulated what we mean by innovation in the PIF on page 19 and 20 including adding in further information on criteria selection noting that these funds will focus on directly addressing the the risks of climate hazards, such as floods and droughts. The criteria and aspects of innovation are based off GRP’s extensive experience running innovation challenge funds. It is also worth noting that these innovation criteria will be further defined during the PPG phase as much of it will be context specific to the countries where the project intends to work. During the PPG Phase country context specific criteria will be defined.

UNDP, 4 June 2020 (jp)
On Comment A. This is certainly the intent of this project. GRP will source the nodes (grantees) that will propose their innovative and conflict sensitive adaptation solutions to the climate change problem . The proposed solutions from the nodes could be credit (loan/repayable grants, micro-credit) or non-credit activities to end beneficiaries (NGOs/CSOs/Individuals/Enterprises). The amount of grant/credit activities proposed by the grantee will be evaluated by the grant committee

established by GRP. To clarify, in order to encourage innovative solutions from the ground, the grantees will propose to the grant selection committee on their designed innovative solutions toward the development challenges, credit activities (loan/repayable grants, micro-credit) that generate reflow to the grantees themselves by working with entrepreneurs. This will be a suggested criterion for the grant selection committee.

On Comment B.

This project's focus on building resilience and climate adaptation through revolving grants with the local actors in the context of conflict and fragility is inherently innovative. While there are other donors deploying grants in these regions, there are very few if any that are focusing entirely on climate adaptation by employing conflict sensitivity approach. The innovative finance mechanisms are characterised in this project by close attention to recipients' context-specific needs with a tight alignment between community needs, national policy objectives, and donor priorities. The grants on the ground will be supported by an innovative technical support facility that will help create the space to test and leverage innovation. Creating opportunities to develop new solutions and innovations that engage with the complexity of adaptation challenges in these conflict-prone and fragile regions will not only help build resilience but will be essential to transforming to sustainable and just development. The innovative approaches that will be applied through this project further include a sustainable grant process through credit facilities managed by grantees, guidance and support that draws from previous grants GRP has implemented to help identify opportunities and obstacles to building climate adaptation at scale, the support of a diverse set of partners across the public and private sectors that will help leverage project outputs and outcomes into policy and help attract additional finance.

A few examples from our current work to demonstrate the likely innovative approaches this project might be sourcing:
UNDP is advancing an enterprise-based and market development approach to support MSMEs on the ground to scale up the adaptation marketplace for the mutual benefit of the enterprises as well as the communities they serve. For instance, in the GCF project, "Enhancing adaptive capacities of coastal communities, especially women, to cope with climate change induced salinity", in Bangladesh, currently under implementation, UNDP is supporting SMEs and CSOs by investing in resilient livelihoods (peer groups and enterprises) and connecting them with financial intermediaries such as Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs). Shamaj Unnayan Shangstha, Nawabeki Ganomukhi Foundation, were two of the on-ground NGO partners that will be providing credit financing to the targeted, extreme poor women, for climate-resilient livelihoods. In the GEF project, "Building Resilience in the Agriculture and Water Sectors to the Adverse Impacts of Climate Change in Sudan", local communities were using 'Sandug', which literally means a box for holding money, traditionally consisting of a group of 10 to 20 women who contributed an agreed upon amount of money or commodity to a group fund. This money is later used to procure agricultural inputs and provide interest free loans to the women. The Village Development Committees established by the project is now officially registered as civil society organizations and linked to a local micro credit institution to expand the 'Sandug' activities to other areas, such as livestock (e.g. sheep fattening, increasing twinning and increasing goats' milk production). These types of resilience building approaches are potential grantees/beneficiaries that we aim to work with in this project under the context of fragile regions in LDCs.

UNDP's Youth CO:Lab programme has empowered 2500 young people to launch or advance 500 social enterprises around the world. Many examples on developing business/technology for climate resilience were identified in this programme such as: (i) Smart Farms (Fiji); they provided an automated, mobile app managed hydroponics system where plants are grown in a controlled environment without soil, all year round; (ii) Himalayan Innovations (Nepal); founded by a pair of engineering siblings, the team uses innovative systems such as design technology, blockchain and artificial intelligence to bring creative solutions to rural sectors such as agriculture and energy; and (iii) Malamanila (Solomon Islands): A youth-led social enterprise that harvests and produces pineapple juice to provide employment for youths in post-conflict areas. These innovative approaches are also what this project will aim to source and scale-up.

GRP has supported over 36 innovative projects across the Sahel, Horn of Africa, South and Southeast Asia. This model of supporting innovation is the same proposed in this project, where open and competitive calls for ideas are sourced and then nurtured to flesh out innovation. One innovative project example from this work to support adaptation is a Sharia compliant loans program that focused on making finance and markets inclusive to build adaptation. The Taking Risk out of Agricultural Trade for Relief and Development Enhanced with Resilience (TRADER) project designed an innovative sharia compliant financial product to support improved market functions within the livestock system in Wajir, Kenya. As a result, some 2,000 livestock-keeping households benefited from livestock sales stimulated by the project and were more resilient to a sever drought event. The project demonstrated that providing access to innovative financial services that are inclusive can improve communities' ability to plan for, respond to and adapt to the challenges of climate change.

On COVID issue, this is well noted.

1. Additional section on COVID-19 risk mitigation is added under section 5. Risks. In summary, from the project management perspective, digital engagement will be conducted throughout all project activities instead of in-person engagement until COVID situation improve at a global level. From the project implementation perspective, UNDP and GRP will work with the grantees to design COVID mitigation strategy under each grantee's workplan. Necessary procurement of PPEs for project implementation, if required by the grantee, could be considered under their grant budget. Given the project context and operating environment (fragile regions in LDCs), it might be necessary for the project to provide basic awareness raising and training with regards to COVID. This will be part of the technical assistance provided by GRP to grantees.
2. Firstly, the proposed solutions from grantees that would either building both health and climate change resilience or contribute to economic recovery after Pandemic will be viewed favorably under the grant selection criteria. Secondly, UNDP and GRP will work with grantees to find new ways of building resilience to climate change and stability under the changing world due to COVID; successful lessons based of the context of LDCs will be shared to other vulnerable regions that are facing similar challenges. Lastly, given the timing of the project, it is likely that some of the grantees will be already working on economic recovery at the beginning of the project implementation. Therefore by funding and assisting these grantees, we will be helping the local economic recovery after the Pandemic and contributing to local rebuilding efforts.

9 July 2020, JP

Noted. GRP is the executing entity for this project and will be tasked with grant-making as per UNDP's grants policy. As per our rules, low value grants can be awarded to CSOs and (national or international) NGOs, including non-governmental academic or educational institutions. Grant recipients either represent beneficiaries of the project (private sector/individuals/SMEs) or can be beneficiaries themselves. Grants can be used for credit and non-credit purposes and can either be straight grants or have contingent repayment clauses. The grantees and grant types will be selected based on defined selection criteria and a solicitation process done during the project period. GRP can share the detail defined selection criteria with GEF before CEO endorsement. Grantees are not small businesses, they are CSOs and (national or international) NGOs, including non-governmental academic or educational institutions that work with end-beneficiaries such as SMEs. These grantees will be managing credit activities such as fund disbursement, lending, and manage that contribute to the proposed development solution.

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, 15 November 2019

Please identify opportunities to significantly increase the co-financing for this project. This is especially important given the private sector catalyzation and innovation focus of the Program.

GEFSEC January 22 2020

GEFSEC encourages the implementing and executing agencies to consider co-financing the project from their resources at the PIF stage. In the PPG phase we expect more co-financing sources being identified for the project.

The proposed co-finance of 3 million US dollars is proposed as recurrent expenditure. Given that it is a bilateral fund, can you confirm if it is recurrent or investment mobilized? Also, please elaborate a bit more on this co-finance.

GEFSEC 18 May 2020:

The response indicates that the SIDA co-finance is investment mobilized. However, in the PIF it is still labeled as recurrent expenditure. Please clarify for consistency. Also, the description requested on of how investment mobilized is identified is not provided. This description is required below the co-finance table.

GEFSEC 9June2020:

Cleared as sufficient at the PIF stage. However, prior to CEO Endorsement it will be necessary to provide greater detail on EACH individual source of co-finance, the focus of each, and how the LDCF support will be additional.

GEFSEC 1July2020:

We will be appreciative if you can kindly provide separate entries in the co-finance section for each source of co-financing (Sida, Near East Foundation, BRAC, Mercy Corps, and any others).

GEFSEC 13July2020:

The response that only "Sid" has expressed interested in co-financing at this stage. Please clarify if "Sid" is a typo and use the full name clarity. As requested in the comment above sent on July 1st, please revise the PIF to indicate one source of finance per entry. For example, if the full $3,000,000 in co-finance is from SIDA or a different agency, please revise the PIF to list only that agency and not others that are not committed.

GEFSEC 30July2020:

Cleared as sufficient at the the PIF stage. Please note it will be important to seek additional sources of co-finance and provide detail on any secured prior to CEO Endorsement.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

GRP and UNDP are actively exploring co-financing from bilateral donors, governments and the private sector to expand the funding for this project. A tentative co-financing expected for this project is approximately $3m.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

GRP has hired a consultant to begin working with our partners to identify lessons learned from other funds supporting private sector resilience initiatives in fragile and conflict-prone regions and will continue to invest in the project during the PPG phase to conduct feasibility studies and further develop innovation criteria and identify possible projects and on the ground partners. The proposed co-finance of 3 million USD is investment mobilized to be deployed over the first three years of the project with potential for ongoing funding. This funding will be supplied as part of Sida's commitment to the Global Resilience Partnership. We will also be identifying further co-financing sources at the PPG phase.

UNDP, 4 June 2020 (jp)
Noted, co-finance is now labeled as investment mobilized. Description is now added.

UNDP, 9 July 2020 (jp)

Noted, at the moment, only Sid has expressed their interest in co-finance. in PPG phrase we will work with the other partners to seek their interest on co-financing

UNDP, 20 July 2020 (JP)

Apologies for the typo, it is indeed SIDA that has expressed interested in co-financing. Other partners have expressed interested in some form of co-finance or in-kind finance, but we can't confirm the amount at the moment. Their co-finance will be confirmed during PPG stage after consultations. Updated PIF is now resubmitted with only confirmed co-finance.

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, 15 November 2019

Yes. GEF financing from the Challenge Program do not impact country caps for the LDCF.

GEFSEC January 22 2020

Comments cleared

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

Yes

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

Yes

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

No

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, 15 November 2019

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

Please use the LDCF-SCCF results framework to identify core indicators and targets. Table F is not required as it is meant for the GEF Trust Fund projects.

GEFSEC January 22 2020

As mentioned above, please use the LDCF-SCCF results and indicators framework for this project. The framework/template has been shared with all the GEF Agencies.

GEFSEC 18 May 2020

We note with thanks that the results sheet is included. However, the indicator levels would need to be greatly increased to be able to clear this project. Please consider the number of direct beneficiaries based on the number of individuals who will directly benefit from each enterprise supported. We appreciate the number of beneficiaries will vary greatly depending on the good or service provided by each enterprise, but please consider a range and average in your calculation. For example, if 150 enterprises are supported through this project, and on average the goods or services they provide will each directly benefit the resilience of 200 individuals, than the total number of beneficiaries should be 30,000 (150X200).

Additionally, please indicate a figure for the number of hectares given that there is an indication of focus on landscapes.

Also, the number of people trained seems quite low. We assume more than one individual will be trained for each enterprise, to be conducive to learning and update? Additionally, we assume a greater number of enterprises will be trained than the number who receive capital investment, to account for normal attrition beyond the control of the project?

GEFSEC 9June2020:

Cleared as sufficient at the PIF stage. We appreciate the increase in impact levels for # of beneficiaries and # of people trained. However, we note the # of hectares figure of 1,000 is low, and we will anticipate this being reviewed and increased during PPG stage, especially considering that a number of the enterprises supported through this project will provide adaptation goods and services to other land based MSMEs, and therefore have a leverage effect on the number of hectares managed for climate resilience.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Based on the project design, the following Core indicators are used:

OBJECTIVE 1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation

Outcome 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience

Output 1.2.1 Innovation incubators and/or accelerators introduced

- 15-30 Entrepreneurs supported (at least 50% female)
- 15-30 Adaptation technologies supported (or adaptation focused business models, practices).

OBJECTIVE 2: Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact

Outcome 2.2 Adaptation Considerations mainstreamed into investment

Output 2.21 No. Of institutions with increase access to climate finance

- 15-30 Entrepreneurs supported with grant finance, with the aim of 20-30% receive additional scale up finance from commercial capitals.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

LDCF-SCCF framework attached using the template.

UNDP, 4 June 2020 (jp)

We have adjusted the number of beneficiaries to better reflect who will be supported through the project, but at this stage it is indicative. During the PPG and technical assessment stage we will be able to refine these numbers once we have a clearer indication of the on the ground grants being funded.

Framework template attached. Follow the CCA results framework GEF7 template:

Core Indicator 1	Total no. of direct beneficiaries	20,000
	Male	10,000
	Female	10,000
Core Indicator 2	Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	1000
Core Indicator 3	Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	0
Core Indicator 4	Total no.of people trained	500
	Male	250
	Female	250

OBJECTIVE 1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation

Outcome 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience

Output 1.2.1 Innovation incubators and/or accelerators introduced

- No. of incubators and accelerators supported: 3-6

- Total no. of entrepreneurs supported: 100

Male: 50

Female: 50

Customers supported through each entrepreneur: 200

- No. of adaptation technologies supported: 10-30

Area of land improved due to innovations: 1000 ha

OBJECTIVE 2: Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact

Outcome 2.2 Adaptation Considerations mainstreamed into investment

Output 2.2.1: No. of institution(s) with increased ability to access and/or manage climate finance

- 15-30 with grant funding, 20% with additional scale up capital

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, 15 November 2019

Taxonomy is fine. However, the project is tagged as Adaptation 1 Rio Marker. Given that adaptation is the primary objective of the project the Rio marker will Adaptation 2.

GEFSEC January 22 2020

Comments cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Agreed, Marker changed to Adaptation 2.

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, 15 November 2019

The image with concentric circles is not legible. Please upload in another version, and possibly in the documents section if needed.

Please define conflict-prone, and describe the relationship between fragile and conflict prone, as well as peace and stability (given they are in the title), and how climate change is effecting these. In doing so, please strengthen the argument of how this project's investment private sector innovation will address this inter-related issues.

The explanation of root causes and barriers that need to be addressed to for adaptation-oriented commercial enterprises to function and flourish in fragile and conflict-prone regions is useful, thank you. This would be strengthened by explaining which are root causes and which are barriers. Additionally, in the case of corruption and security in particular, it would be helpful to further explain how these differ in fragile and conflict-prone areas and pose a barrier to private sector innovation for climate resilience and adaptation, visavis other contexts experiencing severe corruption and security challenges.

GEFSEC- January 22 2020

Thank you for the additions to the information in this section, and we continue to find the information on barriers to be particularly relevant. It would be useful to briefly indicate which of these set of barriers listed will be addressed by the project and how.

For example, is a key focus of this project to address "Access to finance?" If so, how will this project strengthen "access to credit", with the PIF importantly notes it is likely to be a particularly severe problem for private firms in conflict prone contexts. Moreover, how will the project ensure that providing grants with no interest or repayment requirement will not have the perverse effect of creating a market distortion for the provision of accessible credit to enterprises that are designed to make a profit over time?

Moreover and for your consideration, in effort to support practical focus and manageable expectations for the project, you may wish to clarify which of these are barriers are intended to be addressed by the project, and which are broader challenges or risks.

GEFSEC May 18 2020

Comments cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Diagram is now legible. We have also clarified the relationship between fragile and conflict prone. The words are used interchangeably in academic literature with the same definitions. We have clarified what we mean by peace and stability as well as provided further detail on how climate change is impacting these. We have also added more emphasis to the role of private sector innovation. The relationship between corruption and private sector development has also been clarified.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

Thank you for the question. We have edited the PIF to focus on three project specific barriers and linked them with project components. Barrier 1 - Lack of local market intelligence, climate-fragility risks information and evidence on existing constrains. Barrier 2 - Access to finance. Barrier 3 – Local businesses lack of capacity, specifically around ESG, gender and social inclusion. As discussed, in order to achieve the development outcome and while considering cost efficiency, low-value grants will be given to local actors that have operations in term of innovative credit/loan facilities, not directly to businesses. The grant funding will provide to these local actors which will propose solutions that can achieve longer term sustainability by either offer credit/loan products or small repayable grants. In addition, given the context of conflict prone and fragility, it is likely that some grant resources will be needed to enhance ESG, gender and social element of grantees' operation as these are additional cost for operation. In speaking with GRP's partners who work on the ground in the countries where we intend to focus, they have stated that this question is context specific and each country will have different barriers that will be best addressed by the project. During the PPG more in-depth analysis of the barriers will be undertaken to ensure that country specificities are duly captured. This will further shape appropriate focus in each country. The 'Assessment and identification' phase during the project will be further used to ensure that no market distortions are created.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

To build on the baseline scenario, please clarify all grants (repayable) to NGOs will be for enterprises, and not for non-income generating activities.

For the grant giving modalities, please note the comments below on coordination and execution arrangements.

GEFSEC, 22 January 2020

We welcome the 70% allocation for private sector and 30% for social enterprises. Regarding, other technical assistance activities mentioned in the response, please clarify if these activities will be funded under the $40,000 investments made in the private sector/social enterprises.

GEFSEC May 18 2020

Comments cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)
Well noted. Adjustments have been made for the investment to focus on the private sector with 70% of the funding allocation, social enterprises will receive 30% of the funding allocation. All investments will be $40,000. With regards to revolving fund, based on UNDP FRR, we cannot use revolving fund or revolving facility.

The context of LDCs, fragile and climate change vulnerability is unique. Given our experience in this setting, enterprises often require significant amount of handholding before they could really grow and scale-up. In addition, technical assistance needs to be provided to these enterprises to encourage good business practices (safeguard practices, labour issues, gender issues) that might not be revenue generated (could even increase costs). Therefore, although most of the funding will be used for income generating activities, some funding and technical assistance support is needed for ESG, gender, climate risk analysis related issues.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)
The technical assistance activities mentioned will be funded under component 3 of the grant and hence separate to the investments in the private sector/social enterprises.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

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, 15 November 2019

It is not clear that a number of the contributions outlined in this section are within the scope of this project (e.g. vulnerability assessments and analyses of the co-benefits of adaptation; integrated planning). Please also provide stronger focus on how this project's focus on private sector innovation will increase peace and stability by increasing climate resilience.

GEFSEC, 22 January 2020

Thanks for the clarification that vulnerability assessments will be carried out during PPG phase. We welcome the private sector focus in the project now which improved the incremental cost reasoning argument. As mentioned above, please (1) respond to earlier comments by elaborating how the project will increase peace and stability in the regions as part of the incremental reasoning. Furthermore, (2) a strong incremental case will be built if the fund is used innovatively. As also mentioned elsewhere in these comments, simply creating a sub-challenge grant fund under an umbrella grant challenge fund limits the incrementality of the project.

GEFSEC 18 May2020:

Please note the comment above requiring further specific explanation of the innovative elements of the approaches to be piloted and tested through this project.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Noted. Climate vulnerability assessments help to understand where the investment is needed (to select most needed project site), this will be conducted in PPG phrase. Integrated planning is to consider the policy environment before investment is made (whether it is following the country's national strategies and plans). As mentioned above, the investment component now focuses on the private sector with 70% of the funding allocation, social enterprises will receive 30% of the funding allocation.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

Given the states in fragile regions, available capital to support businesses that build resilience and peace is close to none. This project will seek businesses with business model that could improve local resilience and stability when they scale and reach more customers. We have included further text to show how the project will increase peace and stability. As noted in the PIF, the role of the private sector in peace building and conflict prevention is increasingly seen as essential. Conflict prevent businesses and private firms from providing the jobs and services needed to increase income levels and meet societal needs. They can contribute to trust and stability by building functioning markets and trading relationships that are inclusive of different groups in society comprising a key part of building social resilience. In addition, firms often contribute directly to local social programs, and work with governments to enhance the investment climate.

This project does not intend to operate like a traditional challenge grant fund. Firstly, given the context and landscape of LDCs and fragile regions, a call of proposal won't find quality proposals and won't reach to the right audiences. Operating in such landscape requires local knowledge and additional research to find the right investable targets. With UNDP's local presences, GRP's on-ground partners, a targeted approach is taken to scan the landscape of businesses; with component 1 grant funding, GRP and its on the ground partners can further the screening businesses to the criteria of this project. Secondly, most challenge fund either only provide capital, or only provide TA/brokering activities. This project intends to combine the two approaches, providing capital and TA/investment, brokering support to the funded innovators, this is much needed given the operating landscape. Lastly, most challenge funds do not have follow up activities after fund closing. The innovators funded under this project will be alumni of UNDP, our support to these innovators do not stop after the project; this again leverages UNDP's country offices network and long-lasting public and private local networks.

UNDP, 4 June 2020 (jp)

Addressed above.

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, 15 November 2019

As indicated above, please indicate the estimated adaptation benefits of this project using the GEF-7 LDCF results framework. Just aligning with LDCF objectives is not sufficient even at PIF stage. In this section, please indicate how the project will deliver these benefits.

GEFSEC, 22 December 2019

As suggested in section 1, please use GEF's results framework to provide estimated adaptation benefits from the project. The framework includes core indicators which the project has to estimate and in this section a brief description of these benefits needs to be included.

GEFSEC 18 May 2020

Please note the comments above on indicator levels to be addressed in a resubmitted PIF.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Based on the project design, the following Core indicators are used:

OBJECTIVE 1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation

Outcome 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience

Output 1.2.1 Innovation incubators and/or accelerators introduced

- 15-30 Entrepreneurs supported (at least 50% female)
- 15-30 Adaptation technologies supported (or adaptation focused business models, practices).

OBJECTIVE 2: Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact
Outcome 2.2 Adaptation Considerations mainstreamed into investment
Output 2.21 No. Of institutions with increase access to climate finance

- 15-30 Entrepreneurs supported with grant finance, with the aim of 20-30% receive additional scale up finance from commercial capitals.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

Framework template attached. Follow the CCA results framework GEF7 template:

Core Indicator 1	Total no. of direct beneficiaries	30
	Male	15
	Female	15
Core Indicator 2	Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha)	0
Core Indicator 3	Total no. of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	0
Core Indicator 4	Total no.of people trained	150
	Male	75
	Female	75

(assume each entrepreneur have 5 employees)

OBJECTIVE 1: Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation
Outcome 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience
Output 1.2.1 Innovation incubators and/or accelerators introduced

- No. of incubators and accelerators supported: 2-5
- Total no. of entrepreneurs supported: 15-30

Male: 7-15
Female: 7-15

· No. of adaptation technologies supported: 5-10

OBJECTIVE 2: Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact
Outcome 2.2 Adaptation Considerations mainstreamed into investment
Output 2.2.1: No. of institution(s) with increased ability to access and/or manage climate finance
· 15-30 with grant funding, 20% with additional scale up capital

UNDP, 4 June 2020 (jp)
Addressed above.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 15 November 2019

Please strengthen by describing the investor/enterprise matchmaking strategy and its activities.

Please also strengthen by expanding on the design of the revolving grant facility with the use of GEF funds, and consider options for co-finance to be used for loan and equity investments.

GEFSEC 18May2020:

Please note the comment above requiring further specific explanation of the innovative elements of the approaches to be piloted and tested through this project.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)
Well noted. More in-depth research will be conducted at component 1 to gather market intelligence of local capital provider, upper supply chain companies, MFIs, commercial banks and domestic state-owned or development banks information at the targeted project areas. Output 3.2 has been changed to specifically catalyze private investment by providing promising enterprises with investment matchmaking support to these capital providers and supply chain actors. This could be either conducted through regional workshop or local networking events organized by grantees themselves through the assistance of the project.

Based on the comments received, we have discussed and adjusted our investment to focus on the private sector with 70% of the funding allocation, social enterprises will receive 30% of the funding allocation. All investments will be $40,000.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)
This has been addressed above in the earlier comment.

UNDP, 4 June 2020 (jp)
Addressed above.

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

GEFSEC 15 Nov2019:

The Figure 1 in the PIF indicates the global fragility and climate change hot spots. Will the project focus on all these regions? Please indicate in this section with a map.

GEFSEC 22 January 2020

A map indicating targeting regions/countries required at the PIF stage.

GEFSEC 18 May 2020:

Cleared at the PIF stage. At the CEO endorsement stage more specific coverage would be required.

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 entrepreneurism 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.

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 13 November 2019

Please provide further information in this section on the Stakeholder engagement to date , and the proposed means of future engagement.

22 January 2020

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

UNDP has already starting internal consultation with GEF Small Grant Programme, Youth Co:Lab, UNDP DRR team and various innovation financing initiatives to source potential grantees and discuss project sites. An initial stakeholder table is added in the PIF. In the PPG stage, initial outreach will be conducted to selected countries through UNDP Country Offices, informal consultation will be conducted with local NGOs/capital providers. GRP has been investing in food and water security measures in conflict prone areas of the Sahel and Horn of Africa as part of peace building from 2014-2019. Initial consultations have taken place with Mercy Corps, Care and the Near East Foundation, who are all focusing on investing in private sector led water and food security innovations to support stability and peacebuilding in conflict prone and fragile regions. GRP will work with these partners and others to develop a detailed stakeholder map during the PPG stage across the regions.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 13 November 2019

Please provide further consideration of how climate impacts women and men differently in fragile and conflict-prone contexts, and gender considerations important for design of the project outputs and activities.

22 January 2020

Comments cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

We have included a section on the role of gender in peacebuilding and stability specifically how it links to water and food security. This will be further detailed during PPG.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 13 November 2019

Noting the comment from STAP on lack of private sector engagement and catalytic focus, please strengthen this section by also outlining the role of any private finance providers in the project, and ensure this is reflected in other sections.

Please also explain how this project will draw expertise of over 50 private sector strengthening partners, what they will do for the project, and clarify this in other relevant sections.

22 January 2020

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

In the PIF, we stated that we will draw from over 50 partners including the private sector. GRP has reached out to Mecry Corps, Care and the Near East Foundation to seek their interest in terms of implementation support. Once the project is in PPG stage, GRP will host virtual meetings to draw expertise from the partnership into project design. It is also our intention to hold a focused face to face meeting with key relevant partners in 2020. We have added details in the PIF.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 13 November 2019

This is a useful analysis of risks.In addition to lack of participation in the call for proposals, please consider the risk of a lack of quality proposals that are adaptation oriented, income generating, and feasible. Please also include consideration of the risk of low rates of repayment of grants.

GEFSEC 22 January 2020

Assuming that there will be some returnable funds offered to target enterprises, please include risk of low rates of repayment and risk absorption/mitigation measures.

GEFSEC 18 May 2020:

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Well noted. The above suggested risks are added to the PIF.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

Added per suggestion.

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, 13 November 2019

As the agency is well aware of, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate as per GEF policy and guidelines. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis, based on country requests. We strongly encourage the project proponents to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for project execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses or encourages any alternative execution arrangement.

As has been discussed previously for this specific project, please identify an approach for the implementation and execution roles of this project to be performed by different institutions. As also mentioned previously, we encourage considering GRP performing the full project execution role.

January 22, 2020: Well noted and thank you. However, please clarify what is meant by “GRP’s partners network is also been consulted for becoming the executing entity or responsible party for this project.”

GEFSEC 18 May 2020:

Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Noted. GRP has been identified as the executing entity (under UNDP policy: Implementing Partner). The Implementing Partner is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources. UNDP will conduct capacity assessment of the identified Implementing Partner as part of UNDP’s oversight function during PPG. GRP’s partners network is also been consulted for becoming the executing entity or responsible party for this project.

UNDP, 4 May 2020 (JP)

This has now been removed below as we anticipate GRP to the become the executing entity once capacity assessments are conducted and approved.

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, 15 November 2019:

Please provide input in this section, as is required for global as well as regional and national projects. For example, references can be made to types of national planning, reports, assessments and commitments, made in the context of international Conventions or otherwise.

GEFSEC 22 Jan 2020:

Comments cleared

Agency Response

UNDP, 19 Dec 2019 (JP)

Noted, section 7 added. Information added around NAP, UNFCCC framework, National Development Plan and Global Commission of Adaptation.

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, 13 November 2019

Yes

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, 1July2020:

We note the PIF mentions that environmental, social and governance criteria will be established and that UNDP Social and Environmental Safeguards Procedure (SESP) will be used to ensure the controls of this risk are in place. However, the PIF does not provide information of overall environmental and social risk. Please provide early screening results (e.g. include the completed UNDP “Social and Environmental Screening Template in the document uploads section and refer to this in the PIF text). Alternatively, please provide indicative information on environmental and social risks, including preliminary overall risk classification of the project, the types and risks identified, and their potential impacts.

GEFSEC 13July2020:

Cleared. However, the second sentence in the Agency response below of 9 July appears to be complete. Is the word "in" missing between "identified" and "this", so the sentence should read "...identified in this SESP"?

Agency Response

9 July 2020, jp

Please see attached UNDP internal approved SESP at PIF stage. Most ESS related risks are identified in this SESP. In the grantee screening stage, we will ask them to evaluate against the risks in this SESP while proactively evaluate their potential ESS risks.

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, 13 November 2019

N/A, given this is a global project.

GEFSEFC, 1July2020:

Kindly note that prior to CEO Endorsement, Letters of Endorsement will be required from OFPs of countries in which there will be GEF financed activities.

Agency Response

Noted.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 13 November 2019

N/A

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, 15 November 2019

Please address the comments and suggestions in this PIF review, and resubmit.

GEFSEC 22 January 20202

Please address the additional comments.

GEFSEC 18 May 2020:

Please address the additional comments.

GEFSEC 9June2020:

Yes, this PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC 13July2020:

Not yet. The most recent comment on Co-finance has still not been properly addressed.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Further explanation will be required in the CEO endorsement documentation of the set of specific innovative approaches that will be piloted and tested through this project. This further description of innovation in this project must include specification of the approaches being deployed to address climate impacts that have either not been used before to address the specified climate adaptation related challenge, and/or have not been used before in the project area.

- Please also fully incorporate and expand on explanations related to the repayment instruments.

- A detailed explanation will be required of the mechanism through which the Executing Entity (South Pole Carbon Asset Management, Ltd.) will select the small business, disburse the funds and manage the reflows (if any).

- Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, we would like the CEO Endorsement to factor in the situation and propose:

1. Measures the project will take to minimize risks to project implementation cause by COVID-19; and
2. How the project may contribute to economic recovery from the Pandemic and integrate with broader rebuilding efforts

- We note the # of hectares figure of 1,000 is low, and we will anticipate this being reviewed during PPG stage and increased prior to CEO Endorsement, especially considering that a number of the enterprises supported through this project will provide adaptation goods and services to other land based MSMEs, and therefore have a leverage effect on the number of hectares managed for climate resilience.

- Prior to CEO Endorsement, Letters of Endorsement will be required from OFPs of countries in which there will be GEF financed activities.

- Please note it will be important to seek additional sources of co-finance and provide detail on any secured prior to CEO Endorsement.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval