



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

GEF ID:	<b>9138</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Malawi</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Food-IAP: Enhancing the Resilience of Agro-Ecological Systems (ERASP)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IFAD</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5; BD-3 Program 7; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$183,486</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,155,963</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$87,397,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$94,736,449</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Fareeha Iqbal</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Stephen Twomlow,</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>		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

<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)?

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
<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>		
	<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>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	FI, 7/11/2016: This is a child project under the Food Security IAP, for which there was no PIF stage required. The Agency states in the ProDoc that budget allocations requested from across the FAs have been adjusted during project design. However, this did not result in any change in the total grant amount approved for the country.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	FI, 7/18/2016:  - CLIMATE RESILIENCE: a) Please outline how the national meteorological services -- or other advisory department on climate change -- will serve in the institutional arrangements for the project. (Even though the agro-climatic advisories will be provided through the GFCS, rather than the Dept. of Clim. Change and Met. Services, the latter is a relevant stakeholder that should be involved.)  b) With respect to monitoring and assessing resilience, please clarify whether resilience would be considered primarily at the household level, or whether Component 3 would include a broader, system-wide	9/7/2016: <b>CLIMATE RESILIENCE:</b> The Department of Climate Change and Meteorological Services is leading the development of the national framework for climate services in Malawi. The activities for improving climate services will thus be implemented by the Meteorological services (Pg 17, CEO endorsement document; Pg 26 ERASP PDR). The Department was a key stakeholder in the preparation of the ERASP and provided the input regarding these activities.  Resilience will be monitored at household level by using the IFAD Multidimensional Poverty Assessment Tool (MPAT) including the climate change resilience module. Since it is well recognised that poverty is closely linked to climate change vulnerability a decrease in multidimensional

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>approach to assessing and monitoring resilience.</p> <p>- GENDER: The theory of change could better reflect the evidence of the imperative to address gender gaps to achieve the outlined project outcomes. Specifically: (a) It could better elaborate on how to address issues of equal rights and access to land. In many places in Malawi, women's access to land and ownership of land is heavily restricted, which in turn impacts the project's ability to encourage the production of food crops through the use of incentives and promote the adoption of appropriate inputs and technology. That said, the project has identified many good targeted activities to promote equal opportunities related to participation/leadership, workload and decision making.</p> <p>(b) It could include some gender responsive indicators to measure change in terms of access, benefits and control. As it currently stands, it is focused on participation. It would be great for example if indicators could be disaggregated on annual income generated from NTFP/goats and chickens etc.</p>	<p>poverty level will also increase households resilience. Further the MPAT with the added resilience module also looks at ha of land cultivated by the household under climate resilient management practices, availability of water and efficiency in water use, gender disaggregated participation in climate risk management groups, and infrastructure made climate resilient. The results of the MPAT household survey is also aggregated at village level. At the wider system level the ecosystem resilience will be measured through the LDSF which include land degradation prevalence, flood risk, and vegetation cover (reforestation and deforestation and other vegetation). These are all factors important for the ecosystem resilience. To clarify this, paragraph 84 has been added to the PDR main text, text has been added to the PDR appendix 7, and text has been added to the CEO endorsement document paragraph 47.</p> <p>GENDER: a) In the PDR, it is mentioned that a Community Planning and Investment Agreement (CPIA) process will comprise consultations to establish Land and Water Agreements between the WUA, landowners and, where applicable, Traditional Authorities. The consultations will address (i) access to land for farmers with less access at</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(c) In the table outlining indicators on p. 23 of the CEO endorsement document, the last column of the socioeconomic beneficiary households indicator appears incorrect (it is expressed in percent of tons).</p> <p>- GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS:</p> <p>(a) Table 8 of the Economic and Financial Analysis shows that 1.77 MtCO<sub>2</sub> of GHG abatement will occur over 20 years. 20 years is a long period of time for consideration of carbon sequestration from agricultural activities. Would it be possible to consider a 10-year period instead?</p> <p>(b) Please discuss further the proposed activities that will result in avoided GHG emissions of 0.03 MtCO<sub>2</sub> over 20 years (energy efficient cookstoves, energy efficient charcoal kilns, and biogas use). Have business models been prepared? Are there plans to sustainably promote these technologies?</p> <p>FI, 9/20/2016: Agency has provided adequate responses/explanations. This section is cleared.</p>	<p>present; (pg88). This includes women and from previous experience in irrigation schemes, the omen are given equal opportunities for plot allocations. The PRIDE baseline also includes specific targets for women and particularly their roles in leadership and decision making roles. These targets also apply to ERASP. The land access and tenure security will be addressed mainly through the baseline PRIDE. The principles followed in PRIDE will apply to the ERASP as the implementation will be Coordinated by the same Office. The Free Prior and Informed Consent for affected communities will be obtained as detailed in the Resettlement Action Framework for PRIDE (page 163).</p> <p>b) Indicator included: Annual income generated from NTFP/goats and chickens (disaggregated by gender) in the PDR. The annual income from NTFP was already included.</p> <p>c) The figure of 1% is correct and has been maintained while the reference to tonnes has been removed.</p> <p>GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS: (a) While the point is well taken, unfortunately when applying Exact, you define one period for the duration of the accounting for the entire project. Since the project has quite a lot of activities impacting on forest conservation, reforestation and avoided</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>deforestation and forest degradation, we have chosen to use 20 years as the accounting period (7 years implementation phase plus 13 years capitalization phase).</p> <p>(b) In the results sheet of the Exact balance run for the project, the without project scenario would result in GHG emissions of 0.03 MtCO<sub>2</sub> over 20 years coming primarily from continued land degradation and forest degradation and deforestation. These emissions will in the overall carbon balance be avoided by the project addressing these two issues through SLM and reforestation, SFM and establishment and sustainable management of village woodlots. An important activity to enable SFM is to address the pressure on forest resources coming from the needs of fuel wood, which is why the ERASP and the underlying PRIDE has a joint activity on the promotion of efficient cook stoves. The business model to be developed and implemented by both projects focus on promoting the local manufacture, installation and maintenance of the cook stoves through an established and proven service provider and methodology (to be contracted). The aim will be to bring down the price of cook stoves to overcome the affordability barrier and insure local availability. In parallel it will also focus on generating demand for the efficient cook stoves, in order to create a self-sustaining market.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>ERASP will promote the uptake through the catchment management planning process outlined in Component 1 which includes an extensive process of visioning, consultation, land-use planning and evidence-based assessments (see appendix 4 paragraph 27 of the PDR). Likewise the project will promote pilot groups for sustainable charcoal production through efficient kilns and sustainable management of woodlots, this is in line with the newly developed government regulation for licensed charcoal production (see appendix 4 paragraphs 30 and 31 of the PDR). Likewise the project will be supporting alternative energy sources identified with the government and building on already existing pilots. The most promising one seems to be biogas (see appendix 4 paragraphs 34 and 35 of the PDR).</p>
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>FI, 7/11/2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table A co-financing exceeds total shown by \$1. Please revise so that amounts adds up exactly to the shown total (this is necessary in order to avoid system errors in PMIS).</li> <li>- Amounts listed by component in the Project financing column in Table B do not add up to the total shown. Please correct.</li> </ul>	<p>9/7/2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fixed</li> <li>-Fixed</li> </ul>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		FI, 9/30/2016: Cleared.	
	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)	Yes. Increasing climate resilience is an explicit objective of the project. Other major relevant risks have been considered (however, please see comment in STAP section of item 11, below).	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes, letters confirming co-financing of \$87,397,000 million have been provided. However, Agency is requested to correct the discrepancy in Table A referred to in item 3, above.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>Yes, however please see comments below and address accordingly:</p> <p>1) The BD and LD sections of the Tracking Tool do not clearly show the baseline values versus the target values at project completion. Please ensure this information is clearly presented.</p> <p>2) Please submit supporting documentation showing EX-ACT calculations.</p> <p>3) Note and address the following in the CCM sheet of the Tracking Tool:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">a. There is a discrepancy across the figure for Indicator 1 and the total for Indicator 8 (latter total is a larger</p>	<p>(1) OK for the BD TT. However, there is no space to provide info on the targets in the LD TT. These figures are actually provided in the Agro-ecological context spreadsheet.</p> <p>(2) The Exact file for the project is included in the resubmission.</p> <p>(3.a.) The numbers in indicator 8 have been corrected</p> <p>(b.) The 80 ha is not much, however this will be monitored by the LDSF tool to be installed in each participating district, which uses a combination of ground truthing and remote sensing able to capture changes at 10 ha level.</p>



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>number).</p> <p>b. Re Indicator 5, the 80 ha parcel of land is likely to be too small to monitor over time. Please discuss.</p> <p>c. Please enter the amount shown for avoided emissions (0.03 MtCO<sub>2</sub>).</p> <p>9/19/2016: All comments cleared except pertaining to the tracking of BD benefits (see below). Agency has submitted the Ex-ACT calculations.</p> <p>The BD section of the tracking tool shows the same numeric total for baseline "area of coverage" in A1 (adds up to 704 ha) as it does for the foreseen project target. If the area of coverage of traditional crop varieties is expected to increase by the end of the project due to project efforts, the second figure should be higher. Please address.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/2016: Cleared. Agency has addressed the above comments and those provided subsequently over email. Some of the baseline values related to sustainable land management and biodiversity are as yet unknown, but the agency has clarified in the CEO Endorsement Request (para 110) that a baseline</p>	<p>(c.)The amount has been entered</p> <p>11/14/2016: The figures have been changed to reflect the targets under agro-forestry and SFM of 6000 ha and 565 ha respectively.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>survey will be conducted during the first year of implementation that will capture the existing situation and provide information to complete the tracking tool.</p> <p>The baseline survey (and follow-up surveys) will combine basic demographic and socio-economic data with the application of various tools in order to understand and gauge the linkage between increased ecosystem services and resilience, and impacts on food security and poverty reduction.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	n/a	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>FI, 7/18/2016: Complementarity with the IFAD baseline project (PRIDE) is discussed. Please also provide information on coordination with other relevant GEF and non-GEF projects or programs (smallholder agriculture, resilience to climate risk) in the country (e.g., see 'GEF Council' section of item 11, below).</p> <p>FI, 9/30/2016: Further information is requested. We appreciate the Agency's response that coordination will be ensured with various relevant ongoing and planned initiatives (GEF and non-GEF).</p>	<p>9/7/2016: The document discusses about the coordination with the GEF Shire River Basin Project to support community initiatives on alternative energies (pag 16). Collaboration with the World Bank-supported Shire River Basin Project will be undertaken where possible to strengthen the policy messages and dissemination to senior policy makers. (page 32). Other GEF funded projects were also visited during the design of ERASP including the CARLA and SLM projects. These are now closed but the lessons learnt from them informed the approach being adopted in ERASP. Synergies with other on-going programmes will also be ensured through the GEF Project Steering</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>However, we would like to learn more about the proposed nature of such coordination and possible synergy. For instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How exactly will collaboration be sought with DfID, Norway and Irish Aid?</li> <li>- How will lessons and processes from GEF-funded climate resilience projects add value to this IAP project?</li> </ul> <p>12/21/2016: Cleared.</p>	<p>Committee (Pg 36, ERASP PDR). Synergies with other climate reliance projects have also been outlined (Pg 30 CEO Endorsement document).</p> <p>11/14/2016: For the GEF funded projects the coordination will be ensured through the joint planning and review of the implementation progress that will be done through the National GEF Projects Steering Committee. In terms of synergies with other projects, the coordinators will be invited to annual planning meetings for the ERASP (this practice is already followed with the Shire Basin Management project that has World Bank and GEF financing) to exchange lessons and experiences. The project coordinators and some beneficiaries will be invited to the stakeholder workshops and policy briefings. In addition, information about the other climate resilience programmes will be provided to target groups to further explore opportunities in districts where these programmes are being implemented and arranging exchange visits for the target beneficiaries to learn from other experiences and share knowledge. ERASP will facilitate the linkages with other ongoing projects. The Catchment management committees will also ensure synergies among projects are maximised. ERASP will introduce the catchment management committees in the</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			north following the model set up by the Shire Basin Management Programme in the south (Paragraph 79 CEO Endorsement document).
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>Among the proposed activities, the Agency is requested to consider producing a knowledge product(s) on the experience of addressing climate risk -- summarizing challenges, approach, capacity building, and monitoring efforts, with a view to raising awareness on how such an approach can be undertaken and improved upon, in similar contexts.</p> <p>FI, 9/30/2016: Cleared.</p>	<p>9/7/2016: The project KM activities will be performed in conjunction with PRIDE and include a detailed plan on how information will be obtained and disseminated using the MIS, project reports and reviews, development of knowledge products, policy workshops and the use of communication channels. The draft KM plan for ERASP (see Appendix 7, # 25) includes, among others, the following KM objectives: a) Influence policy to increase financing for scaling up adaptation activities (resulting in the following products: Detailed studies such as climate scenarios; Policy briefs; Evidence-based lessons learned on successful approaches to adaptation; etc.); and b) Contribute to body of knowledge on project themes (i.e. climate adaptation) for which the related final products would be more along the lines of studies and journal articles. The suggested product(s) on the experience of addressing climate risks will be produced under these two objectives of the KM plan. A detailed timeline for production and associated costs will be included in the final KM plan to be</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			developed after project start up.
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	<p>FI, 7/21/2016: No. Agency is requested to respond to STAP comments on the FS IAP PFD as appropriate for this child project, e.g., item 8 (of STAP report) requests agencies to include in the Risk Matrix an item on challenges to scaling-up of technologies and practices, and how the project will reduce this risk.</p> <p>FI, 9/30/2016: Yes, cleared. Agency has adequately incorporated additional risks as recommended by STAP.</p>	<p>9/7/2016: The risks to scaling up are included in the table provided with mitigation measures identified (pg. 27 CEO endorsement document). The risks are social (low adoption of practices), institutional (limited capacity at district level) and political (discontinuation of practices) in nature.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	<p>FI, 7/21/2016: No. Agency is requested to please respond to Council comments on the FS IAP PFD as appropriate for this child project (for example, Germany has requested synergy with specific BMZ programs in Malawi.</p> <p>FI, 9/30/2016: Further information is requested. Agency is requested to submit a response matrix corresponding to</p>	<p>9/7/2016: Synergies will be ensured with the approach being taken in the two BMZ programmes in Malawi, Food and Nutrition Security Programme and the Green Innovation centres for agriculture and food sector. The former targets Dedza and Salima, which are priority districts for climate change adaptation. The nutrition focus is being emphasised in both PRIDE/ERASP and the entry points of schools and support to district teams can be adopted in the ERASP/PRIDE districts.</p>	

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Council comments (including, but not limited to, the comments provided by Germany). Please note that even if the Malawi project is not mentioned explicitly in Council comments, several of the comments are broad/general and apply across the FS-IAP, including to this project. We would therefore request that all comments that have relevance to SLM/adaptation/FS policy or investment kindly be considered and responses provided.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/2016: Yes, relevant Council comments pertaining to the PFD have been addressed, including those provided by Germany and the US.</p> <p>FI, 3/24/2017: Yes, all Council comments on project docs addressed.</p>	<p>The value chain linkages under the Green Innovation Centres is also being adopted under PRIDE/ERASP. As such in value chains selected by the smallholders under PRIDE, duplication will be avoided and information on the centres provided to the farmers and the reach of the centres can be enhanced through the PRIDE/ERASP beneficiaries (pg 30 CEO endorsement document).</p> <p>11/14/2016: A response matrix responding to the Council comments has been included Annex B CEO Endorsement document pg. 42).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p>	<p>12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?</p>	<p>FI, 7/21/2016: Agency is requested to respond to comments for items 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, 10 and 11.</p> <p>FI, 10/5/2016: Agency is requested to respond to comments for items 6, 8 and 11.</p> <p>FI, 12/21/2016:</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Yes.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 21, 2016	September 07, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 05, 2016	December 21, 2016
	Additional Review (as necessary)		