



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

GEF ID:	<b>9140</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Regional (Burkina Faso, Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Food-IAP: Cross Cutting Capacity Building, Knowledge Services and Coordination Project for the Food Security Integrated Approach Pilot Program</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-4 Program 5; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$183,486</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$10,825,688</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$85,057,850</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$96,067,024</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Mohamed Bakarr</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Eric Patrick</b>

PIF Review			
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		

<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
	degradation, issues of sustainability, 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):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
• Focal area set-aside?			
<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?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>This is a child project under the Food Security IAP program, for which the PIF stage was not required. The project has been designed in line with the Program Framework Document, which identified all relevant GEF strategic objectives for alignment.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>The overall structure and design is appropriate and very much in line with the need to both achieve coherence in the Food Security IAP and deliver tangible outcomes at the regional level. There are however inconsistencies that need to be addressed, including the following:</p> <p>1) Both the IFAD Main Report and CEO Endorsement template identify three main functions of the project, but fail to clarify how these are mapped to the project component. It would seem prudent to consider components 1, 2 and 3 and "functions"? Please clarify and</p>	<p>Q2 Comment 1: 'Clarify how Hub project functions are mapped to the Hub project components'</p> <p>The Hub project has 3 primary program management related functions:</p> <p>(a) Program Coordination (via all-project annual planning, Steering Committee, visits to projects etc)</p> <p>(b) Knowledge Management &amp; Communications (external/internal)</p> <p>(c) Monitoring and reporting (via IFAD)</p> <p>Another way to think about the functions of the Hub project would be in terms of project objectives (and also described in the project document in this way):</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>include a paragraph explaining how "functions" and "components" these are related.</p> <p>2) Component 1 will have a critical role in anchoring the IAP program at the regional level in SS Africa. The SPI is noted a means of achieving this, but it is not clear how the challenge of sectoral silos between environment and agriculture will be tackled. How will the SPI for example bridge or engage regional processes such as the AMCEN (environment), AMCA (agriculture), NEPAD/CAADP of the Africa Union, and the African Green Revolution Forum? What entry points have been established by the partners (FAO/UNEP) for such an engagement?</p> <p>3) Component 2 is intended to influence scaling-up through spatial (production systems) and vertical (value chains) integration, which is very much needed. Please provide a description of the production systems and value chains "of regional significance" to be targeted, including how this links with and complements those prioritized by the participating countries.</p>	<p>(a) Linking country level projects to each other for mutual learning</p> <p>(b) Linking the program to relevant initiatives, policy discourse and stakeholders; for mutual benefit</p> <p>(c) Providing guidance / technical support on key program themes where there is demand and sufficient resources</p> <p>It is important to clarify that there in not a 1:1 correspondence between project components and the functions.</p> <p>There intentionally is a 1:1 correspondence between the first three components of the Hub project and the three components of the country projects.</p> <p>However the manner in which these components will be delivered, the scale at which they will be delivered and to some extent the partners through which they will be delivered are different in the Hub project compared to country projects.</p> <p>It is important to emphasize that there will be some level of support provided with respect to each component, and that all country projects will benefit from this (for example, for C1, good practice in bridging the agriculture &amp; environment divide), as well as a separate set of activities on that theme which are specific to the regional scale and involve a different set of stakeholders.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>4) In relation to the comments on components 1 and 2 above, how will the child project engage with major private sector processes such as "GROW Africa" to influence considerations for the environment in production systems and value chains?</p> <p>5) Given that the child project has its own unique elements for M&amp;E, the program-level M&amp;E is also an essential aspect and needs to be clear. Please provide a clear explanation of how the program level M&amp;E will accommodate both outcomes at regional level and those based on aggregation across country child projects.</p> <p>6) With respect to the institutional arrangements, please clarify why IFAD will have what seems like a passive role in the ISC. How will an observer role be reconciled with IFAD's role as lead Agency for the IAP program?</p> <p>April 24, 2017</p> <p>All comments have been adequately addressed, and documents updated accordingly.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	<p>Please note there is an additional component only for the Hub project, on project/program coordination – this is a vehicle through which funds are channeled to establish the governance structures of the program, run the Project/Program Coordination Unit (PCU) and manage the six-monthly or annual all-project gatherings where collectively progress is reviewed, problems solved, learning shared, and planning undertaken.</p> <p>Only a sub-set of specific technical topics (for example, Climate Smart Agriculture) can be addressed by the Hub project in terms of guidance / technical support to country project teams</p> <p>The choice of these priority themes was based on a questionnaire, a review of themes found in the PIFs, as well as demand expressed at an all-design-team meeting. Finally, some cross-cutting constraints or opportunities were identified, such as farmer advisory services and the promotion of sustainable value chains independent of country project demand</p> <p>See pages 7-8 of the CEO Endorsement document and pages 11-12 of the IFAD PDR for the description of the functions of the Hub project.</p> <p>A paragraph summarizing the relationship between the Hub project functions, the Hub</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>project components, and the country project components has been added in PAGE 10 of the CEO and PAGE 12 of the IFAD document</p> <p>Question 2, Comment 2 "SPI: bridging of sectoral silos, entry points with key fora":</p> <p>The Science-Policy Interface (SPI) has been designed by FAO and UNEP in part on a detailed review of potential fora, networks, policy outlets etc during the PPG phase, against agreed criteria. This detailed review inventories the key agricultural and environmental communities / communication vehicles which will be targeted, as well as highlighting those which appear to bridge agricultural and environmental aspects of food security policy and practice in Africa.</p> <p>It is worth noting that FAO and UNEP were originally going to receive PPG to undertake separate studies to inform the project design with respect to Component 1; however they quickly recognized that this would reinforce the silos to which the GEFSEC comments refer. Nevertheless the reality remains that the communities of knowledge and policy practice in the food security space tend to have developed around either agricultural production or ecosystem function maintenance perspectives and disciplinary concepts. Some concepts/communities of practitioners have attempted to explicitly combine these, such as "agro-ecology" and these will be starting point</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>for the SPI.</p> <p>Nevertheless the most influential forces on policy making tend to come from traditional, siloed constituencies and these therefore also have to be engaged and challenged. As such the products, channels of communication and messaging will have to be audience specific. The IFAD PDR also contains a detailed Knowledge Management and Communications plan which will also inform and be coordinated with the SPI activities.' See pages 80-81 of the IFAD PDR regarding the activities which are intended to bridge environmental and agricultural agendas.</p> <p>It is important to note that the SPI is not primarily intended to be a new platform nor to reproduce what is already out there, but rather specifically to bridge these sources of knowledge, stakeholders and influence pathways. In other words, through the SPI the Hub project / the IAP Program will have at its disposal a space within which relevant expertise/entry points/partnerships/tools/budgets</p> <p>Component 1 will have some activities which are specific to the IAP country projects and some which are primarily aimed at external stakeholders. The findings of the PPG funded review of platforms of potential interest have been summarized in the CEO &amp; IFAD documents, but it also remains as a stand-alone</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>document which will inform the operationalization of the SPI following a validation exercise with a larger set of stakeholders, which will result in the updating of the recommendations of the PPG review document during the first 6 months of project life.</p> <p>In terms of entry points by which (relevant) regional and sub-regional processes will be engaged on behalf of the program in the context of C1, this will be achieved by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Leveraging existing connections for which FAO, UNEP and/or other IAP partners have institutional "seats at the table" (for example AMCEN, AGRF, AMCA etc)</li> <li>(ii) Inventorying partnerships which are not driven by the IAP partners but in which they have had some engagement, then targeting the key ones by formalizing the relationship with the IAP partnership in a well defined manner (from light through to regular, budgeted).</li> <li>(iii) Steering Committee meetings may be scheduled to correspond with key meetings, in order to allow IAP partners to assess the value of working with a given community and possibly an opportunity to generate visibility. The IAP KM/Communications plan in the IFAD PDR highlights examples of the types of events which may be targeted.</li> </ul> <p>Activities through which these potential partner</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>networks / foras will be influenced include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) An analysis of current policies as well as a description of elements of effective policy making which would foster integration at various scales and in various contexts</li> <li>(ii) Specialized workshops promoting the why and how of multi-sectoral approaches for food security</li> <li>(iii) Preparation and presentation of compelling case studies, combined with an analysis of success factors</li> </ul> <p>A description of entry points will be added to the PDR on page 80 and in the CEO Endorsement document on page 9</p> <p>Question 2, Comment 3 "Describe production systems and value chains to be supported and the relationship to those targeted by country projects"</p> <p>The specific value chains (VCs) which will be the focus of the activities under Component 2 by UNDP and AGRA (scaling up) are not determined in advance, but will be include ones in which multiple country projects are engaged. The granting mechanism to be managed by AGRA will focus on VCs which are of sub-regional significance (one per each of the IAP sub-regions) and linkages will be established with country projects working on those VCs.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>The Hub project, as a regional activity, will not be restricted from working on VCs which are identified via analysis during the first 6-12 months of the project to be priorities at the regional and/or sub-regional level but do not happen to be the focus of country projects. However all country projects will benefit from activities intended to build awareness of the benefits (and limitations) of a VC approach as a mode of integration and a mechanism for scaling.</p> <p>The production systems which will be supported by the Hub project are not pre-determined and in any case the emphasis is rather on exposing country project teams and stakeholders (and beyond) to the principles and practice of integrated landscape management. In addition, there will be a focus on drivers of (and limitation to) spatially scaling out successful multi-benefit approaches. Specific production systems will most likely include agro-pastoral and agro-silviculture systems (for example so-called farmer managed natural revegetation in semi-arid areas).</p> <p>The onus will be upon country project stakeholders to take advantage of opportunities provided by the Hub project (for example site visits during all-project annual or semi-annual meetings) in order to appropriate and apply these principles in their own contexts. Themes and modalities to be prioritized with respect to both VCs and integrated productionscapes will</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>in part be determined via demand assessment and a capacity needs (across all 3 components) during the first 6-12 months of the Hub project operations.</p> <p>During the all-project-team program design meeting in Addis, a consensus emerged that scaling up on multi-benefit approaches that it will be precisely the combination of integrated landscape and sustainable value chain approaches which will most likely be necessary to achieve the IAP ambitions. Many country projects by that point had already incorporated the principles of integrated productionscapes into their designs, but many had not yet thought much about the power of markets or of engaging along the value chain.</p> <p>However the purpose of the Hub project in part is to expand the horizon of country projects, and this nexus should allow for adaptive management of some country projects to shift the scope of their activities to at least benefit from an analysis of the sustainability of the VCs of the food commodities whose production they are supporting in order to identify opportunities. One of the strengths of the Hub project concept is the facilitation of peer-learning between country project stakeholders, which will most likely include this topic.</p> <p>Question 2, Comment 4 "How will the program engage major private sector</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>processes?"</p> <p>The Hub project will act as a conduit via the activities under Components 1 and 2 on behalf of the program into major private sector processes such as GROW Africa; however engagement at country level will be the responsibility of country projects and “ in practice “ are likely to only occur where a specific set of conditions are met. Therefore this engagement will likely take mainly at the regional or sub-regional level via the SPI, via the Hub KM and Communications plan activities etc</p> <p>Engagement will also take place via connections facilitated by IAP partners such as AFIM and AGRA (as well as IFAD itself) which are already engaged with private sector players and initiatives in this space. Under the Project Facilitation Platform, part of the process by which the AGRA activities will be delivered under Component 2, shortlisted proponents for a grant to support VC activities in the program, stakeholders including the private sector interact in order to better define the activities, roles and modalities. Indeed it is precisely the process of engagement through this process which may be as valuable as the actual technical capacities furnished via the grant recipients. See page 87 of the PDR for a description of the PHP</p> <p>The Hub project would then add value by</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>helping to systematize these relationships on behalf of the program “ for example to possibly identify additional resources (technical, financial or knowledge related), possibly invite their representatives to the annual program planning meetings or vice versa etc.</p> <p>Relevant private sector working groups will be identified as possible meeting points (for example of the Landscapes for People, Land and Nature network) where self-selection has already occurred with impact investors and agri-businesses who understand the importance of sustainability for the long term business model. Eventually these sorts of businesses will influence those of their peers if the model is seeing as working.</p> <p>Question 2, Comment 5 "How will the Program accommodate M&amp;E at both regional level and as an aggregate of the M&amp;E processes of each child project?"</p> <p>Each implementing GEF agency will be responsible for the submission of the respective country projects' Project Implementation Reviews (PIR) to the Program Lead Agency (IFAD) via the Project Coordination Unit (PCU). These results from the country projects will then be aggregated first at the level of the PCU and will contribute to the target GEBs at the Program level based on IAP targets. This will be one aspect of program</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>level M&amp;E managed via the Hub project. In addition, country projects in the case of the IAP will be expected to define, baseline and monitor changes in "sustainability" and "resilience", both of which are technically demanding and which will take place in a range of contexts. As such most of the actual impact assessment undertaken in this program beyond standard project M&amp;E, will be take place at country project level.</p> <p>Therefore the Hub project via C3 in particular will focus on strengthening the overall M&amp;E capacity at country level as well as help devise and deliver on behalf of the program options for assessing changes in the larger target geography. This will done in part via 3 workshops (an inception workshop in Year 1, mid-term workshop in Year 3 and a final workshop in year 5), and through a capacity needs assessment and training in monitoring and assessment, in particular of GEBs but also of sustainability and resilience. Conservation International will lead on this task. At target geography level the approach used will build on their expertise acquired with the Vital Signs project but enhanced via collaboration with ICRAF and the European Space Agency. Outputs will include Vital Signs atlases at regional level and possibly country level which emphasize hotspots, trends and drivers and which will target policy makers in close collaboration with the SPI/C1 of the project.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>To assess outcomes at the target geography level which go beyond the bio-physical and hence are not readily subject to monitoring via remote sensing, the methodology of Outcome Mapping (OM) will be used (developed by IDRC) and which is used by both IFADs and GEF's IOE. OM tracks measured behavioural changes in individuals or groups that lead to longer, more transformative change, and allows for an assessment of the initiative's contribution to results.</p> <p>See Annex 6.2 for M&amp;E process at the regional and project levels, Table 3 for program level GEBs and Page 38, 131 on Outcome Mapping in the Main Project.</p> <p>Question 2, Comment 6 "How will IFADs passive role in the ISC be reconciled with its Lead Agency status?"</p> <p>IFAD will exercise its Lead Agency role via a number of mechanisms, including the recruitment of a full time Task Manager. IFAD will ultimately be responsible for reporting and to that end will be assigning the services of its GEF portfolio manager at headquarters level to validate reporting coming from the PCU; will also be taking an active role in collectively promoting the IAP partnership through the support provided from its Communications team and representational duties to be carried out by senior management.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>IFAD also has a significant stake at country level, with IA status for 7 of the 12 projects, with support to these projects coming from the IFAD country office concerned, the regional divisions in which they fall, and with active oversight from the Regional Climate and Environment Specialists, who are responsible for GEF projects and sit partly in the Environment and Climate Division and partly in a Regional Division.</p> <p>These RCESs will play a key role as intermediaries between those country projects for which IFAD is the GEF Agency and the Hub project PCU / Hub project Coordinator. However they will also work closely with the IFAD IAP Task Manager in so far as the country projects in their region act as part of the larger IAP program.</p> <p>IFAD policies do not allow IFAD to be voting member of a Steering Committee for a project for which it also has fiduciary responsibilities (in this case as a kind of trustee of GEF funds). However IFAD can and will participate as an observer to the Steering Committee meetings, will organize the first such meetings (at the program launch workshop) and insists upon exercising a no objection over the decisions of the Steering Committee. These decisions will be forwarded by the Coordinator of the PCU, who acts as the Secretary of the ISC, to IFAD. The details of the ISC can be found on page 105 of the PDR.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			In short the program and Hub project have been designed to ensure that there will be continuity in the IFAD involvement in the IAP from country level through the Hub project through program guidance / quality control / representation to external stakeholders.
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>The financing is adequate and cost-effectiveness is demonstrated through the institutional collaboration mobilized during the design phase. However, it is not clear how the breakdown between components and partners will add-up toward a constructive delivery of the child project and overall program. Specifically, two key partners - AGRA and Bioversity - with important roles will be "sub-contracted" not by IFAD, but by other participating GEF agencies. Please clarify how this subsidiary arrangement will ensure constructive engagement by the partners, including the terms and actual amounts to be committed for the sub-contracts.</p> <p>April 24, 2017</p> <p>Comment has been addressed.</p>	<p>In terms of the contextual concern about "the breakdown between components and partners" this was undertaken on a consensual basis following an analysis by IFAD leading to a matching exercise between project need and comparative advantage of each partner. This has subsequently been validated with no major disagreements, as indeed the themes/tasks assigned reflect generally recognized comparative advantage (for example FAO on farmer advisory services, AGRA on building market linkages etc).</p> <p>Turning now to the question on contractual arrangements, IFAD would have preferred for the sake of simplicity to contract to only one party, who would then sub-contract the other IAP partners. However as a compromise the current arrangement was agreed by all; ie GEF Agencies will be contracted directly, non GEF Agencies will be sub-contracted by a GEF agency.</p> <p>An exception was made for ICRAF, seeing as they are hosting the PCU, hiring the project coordinator, operationalizing the ISC and arranging the annual all-project</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Cleared	<p>review/planning meetings; ICRAF will also be responsible for Component 4 of the project, to which these same structures / functions are mapped.</p> <p>The tasks for which AGRA and Bioversity are responsible are described in detail in the PDR, are clearly budgeted (see page 44) and at approximately the same level as the other delivery partners, and reflect their areas of expertise. Bioversity and AGRA have actively participated in the project design process as well as in responding to the GEFSEC review of the submission.</p> <p>Both play critical roles in their respective areas of expertise and this is recognized by the GEF Agencies through whom funds will flow and to whom they will be responsible. However in practice Bioversity and AGRA both play a direct role with the other Hub project executing parties in terms of decision making, including participation in the ISC, hire or assign expertise to the PCU, participate as co-organizers in the annual all-project meetings, deliver technical support across the portfolio of country projects etc. AGRA and Bioversity senior management will also be invited to represent the IAP partnership with their respective influence communities.</p> <p>In short, it is important to clarify that the mechanics of a sub-contracting arrangement, which was undertaken for reasons of</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
			<p>manageability of the project from an IFAD perspective, should not be seen to imply a reduced role or significance of these important partners. Each was chosen on account of their unique and critical experience, expertise, tools and modalities of working on topics critical to the success of the IAP: agro-biodiversity and making agro value chains sustainable</p> <p>IFAD will review the terms and conditions of the sub-contracts in order to ensure that they conform with IFAD rules and procedures and this will be stated explicitly in the Grant Agreements with UNDP and UNEP. However seeing as UNDP(AFIM) and UNEP have worked together with AGRA and Bioersity respectively, including with GEF funding, it is unlikely that IFAD would need to intervene in the relationship between them.</p> <p>However in the event of a dispute between executing partners, a number of mechanism are in place to resolve them, as detailed in the PDR, Annexes 5 and 7; however more generally the history of the co-design of the project, the participation of each party in the PCU, the establishment of an ISC and hiring of a full time IFAD Task Manager all significantly reduce the likelihood of either a contract dispute or of such a dispute derailing the project or larger program.</p>
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>Major risks have been identified and</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>response measures provided. Given the inherently complex institutional arrangement for the child project, it would be prudent to highlight potential risks during implementation.</p> <p>April 24, 2017</p> <p>The response to comments in #4 above addresses this concern.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>All co-financing amounts have been confirmed and evidence provided. Please address the following:</p> <p>1) ensure consistency between the amount breakdowns in the letters and the project documents; specifically, the breakdown in Table C requires separate rows for "cash" and "in-kind;"</p> <p>2) where co-financing is from a grant source specified in the letter, that amount must be considered as "cash," such as for SDC grant to FAO Kenya;</p> <p>3) ensure that the numbers add-up across all tables in the CEO endorsement template.</p> <p>April 24, 2017</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>All changes and adjustments have been made.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes the completed TT is included, and given the nature of this child project, no specific GEBs are expected. Nevertheless, the project will play a key role in tracking GEBs resulting from shifts toward to sustainable production practices at multiple scales. In this regard, two separate tables have been included in the IFAD Main Report for GEBs and socio-economic indicators. Please provide an explanation and ensure this is consistent with the CEO endorsement template (including estimates in Table E). In addition, please address the following specifically in the TT:</p> <p>1) Remove all modifications and annotations made, and instead include a paragraph in the CEO endorsement to capture the explanations; please note that even "indirect" estimates will need to be tracked and reported at mid-term and end of project.</p> <p>2) Why is the estimate of 620 million for "low GHG users" being used and</p>	<p>Explanation requested regarding the two tables of GEBs and socio-economic benefits in the IFAD PDR (pages 28 and 29): the second table is simply an aggregation of the targets provided by the country project documents; the first table are the program level targets which come originally from the Program Framework Document. These include estimated socio-economic benefits (number of households affected); however these numbers will be refined early in the project life once a proper baseline is carried out. For the moment they are based on available primary and secondary data</p> <p>1: Done (and paragraph added to CEO/E on page 17 to explain) 2: Modified</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>how does this related to indirect beneficiaries of the overall IAP project?</p> <p>April 24, 2017</p> <p>comments addressed and documents revised accordingly.</p> <p>Cleared</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>January 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes, coordination is appropriately and adequately described.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes, a budgeted M&amp;E plan for the child project is included, and takes into account the project logical framework.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>January 13, 2017</p> <p>Yes, KM and communication is a key function of the child project, and incorporated under a separate component.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Cleared	
<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>	January 13, 2017  Comments from PFD stage and during design phase have been addressed.  Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	January 13, 2017  Comments provided during PFD stage have been addressed.  Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	January 13, 2017  Comments provided during PFD stage have been addressed.  Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	January 13, 2017  No comments were received.	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	January 13, 2017  No, the project is not yet recommended. Please address all comments raised in this review.	

<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
		April 24, 2017  The project is now technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	January 13, 2017	March 09, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 24, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		