



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9303</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Ethiopia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Climate Change Adaptation in the Lowland Ecosystems of Ethiopia</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5630 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,836,073</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$41,200,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$47,036,073</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Dustin Schinn</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Benjamin Larroquette</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is broadly in line with Ethiopia's NAPAs, the findings of its Initial National Communication, and other relevant national policies, strategies, plans and reports. In addition, however, the PIF could describe how the proposed project could contribute	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>towards the implementation of the adaptation measures identified in Ethiopia's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC), which was submitted in June 2015.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe how the proposed project is aligned with Ethiopia's INDC.</p> <p>12/11/15 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies how the proposed project would be aligned with Ethiopia's INDC.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p> <p>The PIF provides a useful description of the baseline situation facing agriculture and smallholder farmers in Ethiopia's lowland regions; but in absence of further details regarding targeting and the baseline scenario it is difficult to assess whether the project would likely achieve sustainable outcomes and whether it presents a clear pathway to scaling up. In contrast, based on the current description it is not clear whether the project is proposing anything qualitatively different or innovative vis-à-vis the baseline initiatives on</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which it would build, or the several GEF and LDCF-financed projects and programs that address adaptation in agriculture and rural livelihoods.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revisit and strengthen Section 1.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>12/11/2015 -- YES. Please refer to Section 4 below.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would target five woredas in five lowland regions. These five regions cover some 65 per cent of the Ethiopia's total land area and more than two thirds of the population. In absence of further detail regarding the targeted areas, populations and production systems, it is difficult to assess the baseline situation and scenario that the LDCF grant would address, and how it would build on and enhance the baseline investments identified.</p> <p>The PIF identifies six baseline initiatives, with associated, indicative co-financing amounting to \$41.2 million. The PIF could further clarify which regions would be targeted under the Pastoral Community Development Project (PCDP). With</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>regard to the Second Agricultural Growth Project (SAGP), the PIF suggests that the project does not adequately consider the adverse impacts of climate change on its targeted production systems. This should be substantiated.</p> <p>Overall it seems the baseline initiatives that would bring co-financing towards the proposed project are tied mostly to Component 3. In contrast, the PIF does not describe the baseline scenario in the targeted areas as it relates to access to agricultural extension as well as hydro-meteorological and climate information services. Section 1.4 refers to the 'MERET' program, but no such program is described in Section 1.2.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed alternative scenario and additional reasoning, components 1 and 2, in particular, are difficult to assess in absence of further details regarding the targeted areas, population and production systems; and the baseline scenario as it relates to access to agricultural extension as well as hydro-meteorological and climate information services. Specifically, the PIF should describe how the proposed</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>project would complement existing LDCF investments, including projects 'Promoting autonomous adaptation at the community level in Ethiopia' (GEF ID: 4222), and 'Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Eastern and Southern Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change – Ethiopia (GEF ID: 4992).</p> <p>As for Component 3, the PIF should describe how the proposed project would be complementary to the LDCF and GEFTF-financed 'PSG: Sustainable Land Management Project-2' (GEF ID: 5220), which covers parts of Tigray, Oromia, SNNP.</p> <p>Finally, with respect to the expected adaptation benefits, the PIF provides little information regarding the potential scope of the proposed project in terms of the number of households or beneficiaries it is expected to reach; or the number of farmers and government officers that would benefit from the capacity building provided under Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(i) provide further details regarding the proposed target areas, population and agricultural production systems to enable an adequate review of the proposed project; (ii) specify the targeted areas under the PCDP; (iii) explain in what ways SAGP would not adequately address the current and expected impacts of climate change, and how the proposed LDCF grant would enhance it in order to reduce the vulnerability of lowland farmers and agro-pastoralists; (iv) provide a clear description of the baseline scenario as it relates to components 1 and 2, particularly in terms of access to extension services and hydro-meteorological and climate on how information; (v) provide further details on how the project would complement existing GEF and LDCF investments in climate information, rural and agricultural adaptation, as well as sustainable land management; and (vi) clarify the scale and scope of the expected adaptation benefits.</p> <p>12/11/15 -- YES. The revised PIF addresses comprehensively the comments provided on the first submission.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed project will target local communities in ten</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>woredas, namely Amibara, Abeala, Tanqua Abergele, Raya Azebo, Borecha, Deguna Fango, Tuli, Deghabur, Mieso and Bosat. The re-submission also provides further information regarding the targeted areas of and relevant gaps associated with SAGP and PCDP.</p> <p>The baseline scenario for Component 3 is clarified as requested.</p> <p>Finally, the revised PIF provides further information on how the proposed project would complement and be coordinated other LDCF- and GEF-financed projects and programs planned and underway in the targeted regions.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>In addition, Section 1.2 refers repeatedly to 'Outcome 4' of the proposed project, whereas Table B only has three outcomes.</p> <p><b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b> Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4 above, please revise the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>12/11/15 -- YES. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the targeted areas, population and production systems the socio-economic aspects and gender dimensions cannot be adequately assessed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4 above, please revisit and strengthen sections 2 and 3 with specific reference to the areas, population and production systems that the proposed project would target.</p> <p>12/11/2015 -- YES. Please refer to Section 4 above.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 above.</p> <p>YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project may be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>DS, August 21, 2017: Funding for this project has become available under the LDCF and an updated PIF has been submitted to ensure that any potential contextual changes in Ethiopia are accurately reflected in the project design. However, as per the procedure discussed during the Adaptation Task Force meeting and elaborated in the 'GEF Secretariat Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline', any submission of updated PIFs should be accompanied by an annex summarizing the specific aspects that required updating. Please provide such an annex, outlining updates vis-a-vis each of the issues highlighted in the 'GEF Secretariat Brief on Updating Technically Cleared PIFs in the LDCF Pipeline'. Please also ensure that any additional updates which may be occurring as a</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>result of this process are going to be reflected in the updated PIF.</p> <p>DS, September 18, 2017: Not yet. The Annex comprising updates seems to omit several aspects in the PIF that would need to be updated, specifically the baseline projects. The project 'Feed Enhancement for Ethiopian Development II' is listed as closing in 2017, as is the 'Sustainable Land Management Project'. In addition, in the description of the baseline project 'Pastoral Community Development Project', the description includes the following statement: "The current phase of the PCDP (2015) aims to improve [...]". Is this still accurate in 2017? A similar statement is included in the description of the baseline project 'Rural Financial Intermediation Programme'. Further, Ethiopia submitted its Second National Communication in 2016, whereas the PIF only lists the First National Communication (2001) in the section on consistency with national priorities. Information on coherence with Ethiopia's Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) is also missing. Finally, please reflect the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) in the</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		<p>section on gender at the end of the PIF - for instance by including a Gender Gap Analysis to be carried out during PPG phase. Please update the PIF to adequately reflect changing circumstances and resubmit the updated PIF along with a revised Annex.</p> <p>DS, December 19, 2017: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF for clearance and PPG.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	September 12, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 21, 2017	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.