



COMPILATION OF COMMENTS
SUBMITTED BY COUNCIL MEMBERS
ON THE
LDCF/SCCF JUNE 2019
WORK PROGRAM

NOTE: This document is a compilation of comments submitted to the Secretariat by Council members concerning the project proposals presented in the LDCF/SCCF June 2019 Work Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CLIMATE CHANGE.....	1
1. Bangladesh: Building climate resilient livelihoods in vulnerable landscapes in Bangladesh (BCRL), (FAO) GEF ID = 10207	1
2. Cambodia: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Based Communities in the Tonle Sap Region, (FAO) GEF ID = 10177.....	4
3. Ethiopia: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia, (UNDP) GEF ID = 10174	5
4. Gambia: Improving Water Availability in The Gambia's Rural and Peri-Urban Communities for Domestic and Agricultural Use, (AfDB) GEF ID = 10199.....	7
5. Lao PDR: Climate Smart Agriculture alternatives for upland production systems in Lao PDR, (FAO) GEF ID = 10187	9
6. Regional (<i>Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu</i>): Climate Resilient Urban Development in the Pacific, (ADB) GEF ID = 10173.....	10
7. Togo: Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo, (FAO) GEF ID = 10165	12
8. Uganda: Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's watersheds, (AfDB) GEF ID = 10203	14
9. Zambia: Climate Change Adaptation in Forest and Agricultural Mosaic Landscapes, (FAO) GEF ID = 10186.....	16
MULTI FOCAL AREA.....	19
10. Global (Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Cambodia, Chad, Congo DR, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Namibia, Panama, South Africa): Global Wildlife Program, (World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, WWF-US) GEF ID = 10200.....	19
11. Regional (<i>Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Lucia</i>): CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multi-country soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems, (FAO) GEF ID = 10195	21
12. Timor-Leste IKAN Adapt: Strengthening the adaptive capacity, resilience and biodiversity conservation ability of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Timor-Leste, (FAO) GEF ID = 10181.....	23

**JUNE 2019 LDCF/SCCF WORK PROGRAM: COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS
(REFERENCE: LDCF/SCCF.C.26)**

CLIMATE CHANGE

1. Bangladesh: Building climate resilient livelihoods in vulnerable landscapes in Bangladesh (BCRL), (FAO) GEF ID = 10207

✓ **Canada Comments**

- The project aligns with the climate change adaptation (CCA) strategies of the country's Seventh Five Year Plan (7FYP).
- The 7FYP identifies districts that are most vulnerable to climate change. Chittagong Hill Tracts (CHT), however, was not identified as one of the most vulnerable zones.
- Inclusion of CHT as one of the project locations should have a strong justification backed by evidence based research.
- The 7FYP puts emphasize on promoting gender sensitivity to disasters and climate change and reducing violence against women through programs and policies.
- Gender equality considerations should be mainstreamed into the entire project cycle to enhance the efficacy of the project.
- The project's intention to implement gender-responsive adaptation plans should be reflected in the results framework/logical framework.
- Indicators should include sex disaggregated numbers.
- There are opportunities to complement and coordinate with the following initiatives:
 - Bangladesh Climate Change Trust Fund (BCCTF): Created in 2009 to channel government funds for addressing climate change including CCA. This fund has approved over 200 projects and disbursed more than USD \$400 million for both mitigation and adaptation programs. In addition to the BCCTF, the Bangladesh Climate Change Resilience Fund (BCCRF) was established in 2010 to fund climate change actions through international donor finance. As of 2015, the BCCRF had disbursed contributions from development partners totaling around USD \$130 million. The country has been innovative in leveraging domestic, donor and private sector funds to meet the funding needs of the trust funds.
 - Green Climate Fund: Bangladesh is one of the recipients of the Green Climate Fund (GCF). As of May 2019, the total amount of approved GCF

funding for Bangladesh is USD 85.0M (total amount of project value is USD 195.2M). So far, 3 projects have been approved:

- Global Clean Cooking Program – Bangladesh (World Bank)
- Enhancing adaptive capacities of coastal communities, especially women, to cope with climate change induced salinity (UNDP)
- Climate-Resilient Infrastructure Mainstreaming in Bangladesh (KfW)

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal and recognizes the high relevance of the proposed project activities in the context of Bangladesh. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that it kindly asks to be addressed:

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- Germany appreciates the consideration of Gender in the project proposals throughout the project cycle and inclusion of the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy. However, the proposal is lacking on clear Gender indicators and inclusion of specific Gender activities throughout all the Components, therefore Germany would like to suggest the inclusion of clear Gender measurable indicators and a better description of intended Gender activities.
- Furthermore, Germany asks to duly consider the importance of linkages with urban areas within the concept. Due to the fact that (i) in the event of natural disasters/climate impact, cities serve as a temporary or permanent shelter for internal climate- and or disaster-migrants, and (ii) are critical factors in the overall value-chain of economic activities of the rural areas.
- Nonetheless, Germany notes the broad foreseen geographical coverage and extensive list of activities. It would therefore recommend to clearly identify the risks for project sustainability associated to covering too broad a range of project activities, as well as potential mitigation measures.
- Germany further welcomes the intended efforts of creating synergies with existing government programs and donor-supported programs. However, Germany strongly recommends to consider stronger coordination with other initiatives and to further explore potential synergies with ongoing international, bilateral and national programs and activities such as:
 - The EU Bangladesh Resilient Livelihoods Programme” (BRLP),
 - Support for the implementation of the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) in Bangladesh,
 - Improved Coordination of International Climate Finance,
 - Adaption to Climate Change into the National and Local Development Planning (ACCNLDP) II,
 - The Nation-wide “Climate Vulnerability Assessment and

- Sector Action Plan for Environment and Climate Change.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As FAO prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge FAO to:

- Provide additional information on how the 4 targeted landscapes were chosen;
- Consider outreach and coordination with universities and other educational entities;
- Consider outreach and coordination with USAID's Asia Bureau on sustainable landscape programs;
- Expand on the modalities for how this project will ensure that local stakeholders have the necessary skills and knowledge to develop resilient livelihood practices;
- Expand upon how FAO will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how FAO will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project and the various existing programs and projects will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that FAO in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

2. **Cambodia: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Based Communities in the Tonle Sap Region, (FAO) GEF ID = 10177**

✓ *Canada Comments*

- The project should consider the implications of land rights issues on program design.

✓ *United States Comments*

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As FAO prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge FAO to:

- Explain how the project will consider the role that upstream hydropower is having on Tonle Sap as most studies have consistently said hydropower is affecting the Tonle Sap's seasonal flows, adding arguably greater strains on the lake and radically reducing sediment flow and fisheries; we would encourage FAO to engage and incorporate the growing body of research on hydropower's effects on Tonle Sap, almost all of which also factor in climate-related variables;
- Consider consulting Brian Eyler at the Stimson Center's Southeast Asia program in Washington, DC, Jake Brunner at IUCN in Hanoi, and John Choi at U.S. Embassy Bangkok;
- Expand upon how FAO will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how FAO will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that FAO in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO

endorsement stage of the process.

3. Ethiopia: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia, (UNDP) GEF ID = 10174

✓ **Canada Comments**

- Please refer to all comments provided for GEF ID 10171 above.
- As both GEF ID 10174 and 10171 focus on technology transfer, the policy contexts and country considerations specific to Ethiopia are similar.

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- Germany kindly asks to correct the reference to the “Strengthening Drought Resilience of Pastoral and Agro-Pastoral Livelihoods in Ethiopian Lowlands (SDR-ASAL)” implemented by German Development Cooperation. The information presented (p.17) is not correct / outdated, starting with the name, but also the budget, running period, target regions, main areas of action, etc. Germany invites UNDP to establish contact with the project coordinators. In this context, additional projects with synergistic objectives should also be consulted to identify synergies and potential overlaps- (e.g. DeveloPPP activities to establish a value chain for sesame and avocado oil, Conservation of Biodiversity and Forestry programme (BFP), and the Natural Resources Stewardship Programme (NatuReS)).
- Germany kindly asks to include a dedicated strategy, as well as risk mitigation measures in the case of drought. This strategy should especially address acutely drought affected communities.
- Germany kindly asks to include a dedicated risk mitigation strategy for the risk of low human capacities at Woreda level. This is necessary as EFCCC is the implementation partner, but has hardly any technical ground staff. Usually Ministries or Commissions of Environment have a regulative and coordinative function, whereas the implementation lies with the mandated sector Ministries. With the recruitment of Woreda level field coordinators parallel structures are created to replace this lack of implementation capacity by EFCCC and lack in cooperation between line agencies presents an additional risk.
- Germany strongly recommends providing more specific information on interventions for other targeted sectors, especially urban communities, the private and insurance sector. For instance, Germany recommends specifying which of these best practices will be implemented in urban communities and more generally, elaborate on which aspects of urban resilience the project will focus on.

- In this context, Germany also recommends to revise component 2 “access to climate-smart technologies”, by a) including stock-take of well-adapted practices prior to the training-of-trainers (ToT), and b) integrating localized weather and climate advisories in the respective governmental institutions, e.g. the District Project Coordination Committee (DPCC). Similarly, if climate risk insurance is a key adaptation strategy of the project, Germany recommends providing more information on how local stakeholders will be prepared and insurance services provided.
- Considering the Vulnerability and risk assessment for local and regional levels as outlined in project component 1, Germany recommends to mainstream these assessments in governmental planning procedures, e.g. participatory land-use planning (PLUP) manual, or watershed management guideline as tools for problem assessment, instead of presenting a stand-alone planning line.
- Germany also recommends to align integrated landscape management approach of component 3 with existing structures, such as the revised PLUP manuals and existing watershed management guidelines.
- Germany recommends streamlining information provided on the number of communities and cities targeted in the next stage of the proposal. For instance, while on page 18, two targeted cities are mentioned, on page 19, component 1 refers to four targeted cities.
- Germany welcomes the proposal’s clear account of the risks associated with climate change for Ethiopian communities. However, the proposal also refers to opportunities linked with climate change (cf. page 13, barrier 2); what these opportunities are is however not explained. Germany welcomes to either specify these opportunities or to eliminate this wording from the PIF.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As UNDP prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge UNDP to:

- Explain how the project plans to overcome the described stigma related to women-specific programming and initiatives;
- Explain if and how this project will take into account pure pastoralists, in addition to farmers and agro-pastoralists, given the significant population of pastoralists in Ethiopia, and relatedly, if and how proposed activities will include livestock interventions, such as water point development and rehabilitation, dry season fodder reserve practices, or improving animal health services;
- Expand on the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including how UNDP will work at the community level to mitigate any issues between dissenting groups (such as pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, and herders); and,

- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that UNDP in the development of its full proposal will:

- Continue to engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

4. Gambia: Improving Water Availability in The Gambia's Rural and Peri-Urban Communities for Domestic and Agricultural Use, (AfDB) GEF ID = 10199

✓ Germany Comments

Germany welcomes the proposal aiming to address climate change adaptation and water availability and sustainable land management issues with the aim of building resilience to climate change by enhancing water supply for domestic and agricultural use, while ultimately improving livelihoods in rural and peri-urban areas of The Gambia. The proposal includes a strong rationale and thorough project description highlighting Gambia's high needs in the water management and sanitation sector. At the same time Germany would like to address some suggestions for improvement to be made in the next phase of finalizing the project proposal.

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- While the overarching project objective of improving water availability for domestic and agricultural use and its rationale are well displayed, the proposal would benefit from more explicit description of how the proposed outputs will be achieved, accompanied by a review of the single outputs. Germany would welcomes a more detailed description and on how the various project outputs will be achieved, including a related approximate timeline. This is especially relevant for outcomes 1 and 3.
 - For instance, in output 1.2.4 an assessment and development of concurrent groundwater recharge systems is planned to enhance storage capacity. In output 1.3.1 climate change risks are to be identified and documented, including vulnerability assessments of communities, water supplies (quantity and quality) and technologies. Germany would kindly ask additional information about the process of implementation of these inputs.

- Once more tangible and measurable outputs have been established, Germany recommends developing a robust M&E strategy in support of the delivery of the eco-system based adaptation benefits as well as benefits arising from increased resilience. This would help to ensure that that project goal will be achieved beyond a mere increase in e.g. sanitation or water management infrastructure.
- Germany would appreciate if more details are provided on the involvement of the various stakeholder groups. So far, it is not entirely clear how and where (in which project components) the project plans to integrate the various groups.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As AfDB prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge AfDB to:

- Expand upon how AfDB will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how AfDB will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities;
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries; and,
- Consider if limited local knowledge of climate issues is a barrier to the successful completion of this project and how it might be addressed.

In addition, we expect that AfDB in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

5. Lao PDR: Climate Smart Agriculture alternatives for upland production systems in Lao PDR, (FAO) GEF ID = 10187

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the project and congratulates the Government of Lao PDR for being the first country organizing a coordinated GCF – GEF National Dialogue with representatives from the two funds. This proposal further operationalizes those efforts and ensures complementarity of GEF and GCF project proposals, as well as coherence with Lao PDR's national climate change plans. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that should be addressed:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- While Germany welcomes the project approach and synergies with ongoing GCF proposals, Germany strongly requests to ensure the conformity of co-financing at Project Documentation stage. Certain projects related to significant co-financing resources such as IFAD (SSFSNP) or World Bank (SUFORD), seem to be closed or on their final stages and recurrent expenditures are indicated as financing others. Moreover, GCF project proposals which will co-finance the proposed project have not been formally confirmed yet. Therefore, Germany strongly recommends making an update of the co-financing presented in the proposal compliant with the 2018 updated GEF co-financing policy and guidelines, that should be submitted and justified in the final Project Document. In addition, the risks of co-financing not materializing, as well as associated risk mitigation measures, needs to be addressed in the PIF. This requirement is obsolete, if planned co-financing is mobilized before the submission of the final document.
- In this context, Germany would also recommend to dedicate a section in the project document identifying the synergies at the component and activity level between the various project proposals.
- Germany recognizes the needs of the recipient in terms of adaptation to climate change and the vulnerability of upland local communities, however the project proposal does not include an initial climate vulnerability analysis of the selected area, therefore Germany would like to emphasize the necessity to further strengthen the additionally reasoning.
- Germany is committed to thorough independent review of GEF projects. However, the project is lacking specific and measurable indicators. To ensure that successful monitoring and evaluation of the proposed project are possible, Germany would like to strongly emphasize the need to include output-specific targets and indicators throughout the project components.
- Germany welcomes efforts to holistically address climate change issues in the project. However, the term “CCA approaches” is mentioned throughout the proposal but no specifics or explanations are provided on tangible investments.

In this context, Special attention should be given to the respect of the investment versus technical assistance ratio presented in the proposal (C1+C2 vs C2+C3) and to ensure that component 2 (C2) and component 3 (C3) are clearly investment oriented, reducing as much as possible the allocation of financial resources to training and workshops under these two components. Finally, at Project Document stage, Germany would recommend to include more detailed information on the types of adaptation investments the proposed program will implement.

6. Regional (*Kiribati, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, Vanuatu*): Climate Resilient Urban Development in the Pacific, (ADB) GEF ID = 10173

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal aiming to increase resilience of critical urban areas and urban services in the Pacific. The proposal entails a strong rationale and thoroughly displays the approach for the single chosen Pacific islands. References to synergies between GEF and GCF activities are especially appreciated. At the same time, Germany would like to express some comments that need to be addressed.

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- Germany would like to emphasize that the (GCF financed-) construction of a desalination plant on South Tarawa is perceived as a high-risk activity, based on the complexity of its nature. Germany would kindly ask that the environmental and social risks of direct or indirect LDCF support to the operation and maintenance of this desalination plant, as well as appropriate risk mitigation measures are included in the document.
- Although the single components in section 1.a.4. are backed up by examples of activities and the LDCF intervention is thoroughly described, it is not completely clear which activities will be implemented and which organisation will carry out each single activity. Germany suggests shortening the general information with reference to what the LDCF will support and instead (or on top, if applicable) add more detailed information on the overall project design, including information on the activities' enablers, outputs and outcomes. Regarding the outputs described in 1.a.4. Germany considers it particularly important that these are backed up by thorough information for the Child PIFs.
- Germany welcomes the list of the ADB projects in the region up to 2017 and the tentative time line of up-coming projects, yet asks for additional information on how project activities will be coordinated with other organisations working on the same topics and region.
- Although the relation to crucial national strategies is well mentioned in the proposal, Germany welcomes the addition of contributions to other existing (international) conventions.

- In the proposal, private sector involvement in the project is mentioned, but mostly described in the form of ADB involvement in private sector development activities in the Pacific. Germany would appreciate if the focus would be directed more precisely to the proposed project. In this context, Germany would suggest to stress the interdependency of the proposed programme with the intervention fields of urban planning, improved housing design, incentives for private housing improvement, networked water management systems and provision of reticulated water to those most vulnerable.
- The PIF outlines several barriers on p.15. However it is not evident, how all of these barriers (e.g. Barrier 2) are addressed by the project. Germany suggests adding some additional information about how to overcome the barriers within the project. Similarly, the risk analysis highlights that 3 out of 4 types of risks are rated as “medium”. In this context, Germany would welcome a more clear-cut explanation on how these risks are planned to be mitigated in the different country contexts.
- With regard to the beneficiaries listed on p. 24, Germany suggests to include additional information on how the different types of beneficiaries are set to profit from project outcomes/ activities.
- Lastly, Germany asks for the inclusion of the date of the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter as it is not displayed in the proposal and is a requirement in the PIF.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As ADB prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge ADB to:

- Continue to involve Pacific Region Infrastructure Facility (PRIF) as an institutional partner as PRIF has a strong working group in urban development and is a great repository of knowledge in this area;
- Provide more specific details about activities being developed, including the activity to “enhance awareness of climate change issues”;
- Explain how you will work with Pacific countries who have already integrated climate change and disaster in both policy and institutional structures; and,
- Expand upon how ADB will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how ADB will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities.

In addition, we expect that ADB in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;

- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

7. Togo: Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo, (FAO) GEF ID = 10165

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal aiming to support mainstreaming of adaptation across sustainable production systems and livelihood generation in the maritime area of Togo. Germany appreciates that the project intends to ensure the sustainability of on-going interventions in the agriculture and fisheries sectors by increasing knowledge and consideration of climate change adaptation. Furthermore, Germany welcomes the thorough consultation of German Development agencies, ensuring complementarity and additionality with ongoing activities. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that should be addressed:

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- As the PIF outlines, the institutional basis for environmental management in Togo is weak and there is little cross-sectoral integration of policies and programs. Germany considers it important to describe in more detail the set-up and functioning of the “mechanisms for cross-sectorial coordination for addressing CCA strategies and practices established”. It shall be illustrated how to ensure effectiveness of such mechanisms in an environment where cross-sectoral collaboration is generally weak.
- In line with the previous point, Germany would consider it helpful to add a more detailed description of the set-up and functioning of and success factors for the foreseen “cross-sectoral data and information system to translate findings from assessments into decision-making processes, policy and planning”.
- Germany would also strongly suggest to add a description of the set-up, functioning, success factors and funding sources of the foreseen “vulnerable communities funding mechanism” for sustainable farming, fisheries, livestock and forestry activities.

- Finally, Germany would appreciate clarification on the number of small farmers to benefit from the project: While section f) refers to “the provision of tools and training for 10,000 small farmers and 2,000 fishermen”, the indicative targets for indicators 1.1.ii and 3.1.i are “5,000 people [with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures]” (1.1.ii) and “5,000 small farmers and 2,000 fishermen [adopt climate resilient technologies/practices]” (3.1.i). It should be clarified how these numbers relate to each other and how they add up to 10,000 people.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As FAO prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge FAO to:

- Include references to the source material for statistics and scenario projections;
- Consult with relevant stakeholders regarding the cultural significance of the sacred forests in Togo;
- Expand on proposals for how to gain needed expertise for data collection to better inform vulnerability of the coastal community to climate change;
- Provide detailed plans for how adaptation measures will be included in plans for the new modern fishing port in the city of Lomé;
- Expand on the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including how FAO will work at the community level to mitigate issues between any dissenting groups; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with each other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that FAO in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

8. Uganda: Strengthening the Adaptive Capacity and Resilience of Communities in Uganda's watersheds, (AfDB) GEF ID = 10203

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal aiming to build adaptive capacity of rural communities and reduce their vulnerability to climate change and variability through integrated watershed management, climate-resilient infrastructure and sustainable agriculture in Uganda. Germany appreciates that the project clearly intends to address core aspects of resilient watershed management. The project document demonstrates that the project is well-embedded in the national policy framework, particularly the National Adaptation Program of Action. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that should be addressed:

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but requests that the following comments are taken into account

- Germany strongly emphasizes the necessity to include relevant stakeholders in project design. Major activities proposed under Outcome 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1. fall under the responsibility of the Directorate of Water Resource Management (DWRM) in the Ministry of Water and Environment. For activities related to wetlands the Directorate of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (Wetlands department) from MoWE is in charge, yet both Directorates are not included. Germany kindly asks that these stakeholders are consulted in the review process of the PIF.
- Regarding stakeholder consultation, Germany kindly asks that the projects includes activities to ensure a close coordination and collaboration between MAAIF and the MoWE. This is important not just on national level but also on regional and district level to make sure that provided funding is used efficiently.
- Germany invites to integrate existing national strategies on water resources in the project more systematically. Especially the National Strategy for Catchment Based Water Resources Management should be included in all catchment management activities (Component 2). Particular emphasis should be put on harmonising project activities with planning processes (catchment management plans). Germany strongly recommends to include the existing catchment area plan for the Awoja Catchment (focus region of the project) in project activities.
- Germany would highly recommend to take existing experiences and lessons learnt from ongoing projects in the area of Integrated Water Management into consideration when reviewing the project. BMZ, EU, World Bank and DFID have provided significant funding to this area. The World Bank alone is currently implementing its Integrated Water Management and Development Project (IWMDP) with a total volume of more than USD 400 million, which touches or directly supports many of these aspects.
- Regarding the support provided under Output 1.1.3 to conservation agriculture, Germany would like to request additional information about the specific project activities. Currently, there are only measures for soil- and water conservation

listed. They are part of CA but fall mainly in the category of initial options. Otherwise it should be renamed to support soil-water conservation as part of watershed management.

- The full proposal should identify clearly and consistently the capacity building measures under component 2. The capacity building measures should support the investments under component 1 and should take existing Capacity Development Strategies (e.g. water sector) into consideration and then build on identified gaps and needs. The current formulated outputs under component 2 do overlap and are quite broad. While the overarching project objective and the rationale of the project components are well displayed, the proposal would benefit from a review of how outcomes and respective outputs contribute to the individual project components 2 to 4. Germany strongly recommends to review the project design regarding the following aspects:
 - Component 2: The component would benefit if outcome 2.1 focused exclusively on capacity building and outcome 2.2 on planning. For instance output 2.1.1. on community action plans could be included in outcome 2.2. Furthermore, it would be helpful to identify the targeted institutions (outcome 2.2.). In this context, the role of the “Wetlands Management Units” and their mapping should be clarified. (Outcome 2.2.1)
 - Component 4: While the overall objective of component 4 is well explained, the focus of the two outcomes could be more explicit. In addition, it could be helpful to specify for the two outcomes how results of the M&E framework will ensure ongoing adaptive management of the project.
- While the PIF aptly highlights how the project is aligned with priority areas of Uganda’s National Adaptation Program of Action, Germany would welcome more explicit references to how the project is contributing to the country’s Nationally Determined Contribution (e.g. section 2 of the NDC), specifically in section 7 of the PIF, as well as Uganda’s NDC Partnership Plan, with the NDC Partnership being an important vehicle to promote NDC implementation.
- As the main baseline project, the Agricultural Value Chain Development Program, focuses on poverty reduction and economic development, it is recommended elaborate on how agricultural development and climate objectives are aligned, trade-offs avoided and considered in PIF measures.
- Finally, Germany would recommend more specific information on how the project aims to ensure long term sustainability and maintenance of infrastructure installed and measures taken.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As AfDB prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge AfDB to:

- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with each other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries;
- Provide details for the activities that will strengthen hydromet systems through transfer of appropriate technologies, infrastructure, and skills;
- Expand on suggested activities to increase local awareness of climate change, as a lack of awareness is noted as a barrier to success;
- Provide detailed plans for how the proposed hydrological and meteorological stations will be operated, maintained, and sustained and how staff will be trained to best utilize them;
- Expand upon how AfDB will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how AfDB will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities;
- Consider how the baseline project may be addressing the non-climate related drivers of land degradation and what steps AfDB plans to take to ensure success in promoting climate resilience in the face of these drivers; and,
- Expand on the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including if there are any major dissenting groups and if so, how AfDB will work at the community level to mitigate any issues.

In addition, we expect that AfDB in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

9. Zambia: Climate Change Adaptation in Forest and Agricultural Mosaic Landscapes, (FAO) GEF ID = 10186

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes that the project is targeting many relevant, cross-sectoral challenges in Zambia and is following a holistic and integrated approach. At the same

time, Germany has the following comments that should be addressed:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- The project design still seems rather vague; it is not sufficiently clear how implementation will be designed in practice and how vulnerable people will thus benefit concretely. E.g., we share the comment in the review document regarding Component 3 and do not think that it has been answered to sufficiently. (Review stated that on: "... enhancing diversified livelihood strategies for climate resilience", the project is expected to benefit 144,000 people. However, it seems unclear how the proposed activities under this component will actually reach beneficiaries on the ground. For example, "participatory selection of suitable climate-resilient species" (Output 3.1.2) or "Development of inclusive value chains for selected crops" (Output 3.1.3) are relatively vague and could consist of technical assistance, training and guideline preparation, while the project needs to have a clear formulation of expected benefits for the vulnerable people on the ground.)
- Germany recommends to integrate water resource management as a relevant sector in the proposed project activities due to its importance for climate change adaptation and the direct linkages to the proposed project and to draw on the German development expertise in Zambia in this area when preparing these measures. In this context Germany emphasizes the necessity of consulting the Water Resources Management Authority (WARMA) in the design process.
- Germany asks for a more in-depth analysis of existing activities in the agricultural sector in Zambia in which all donors are active in order to achieve a meaningful division of labor and close collaboration with projects.
- For Germany, we ask to coordinate already in the planning stage with German DC as GIZ is active in very similar kind of activities as described in Component 2 and 3 in some of the districts chosen (Southern: Choma, Gwembe, Kalomo, Kazungula; Eastern: Petauke). This concerns in particular the GIZ Green Innovation Center (focusing on value chain development and diversification of livelihood strategies) and the AWARE programme mentioned below. Another option would be to reconsider the selection of districts in coordination with GIZ.
- Germany welcomes the effort of creating synergies with related climate-oriented projects (e.g. Zambezi Basin Initiative (ZRBI), REDD+, Community Forest Program (CFP) and UNDP implemented LDCF project (GEF ID 3689). However, Germany strongly suggests the inclusion of GIZ projects around the topic of climate change adaptation with specific focus on smallholder agriculture and water resources management, primarily the Accelerate Water and Agricultural Resources Efficiency (AWARE) Programme.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

As FAO prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge FAO to:

- Expand on how this project is in line with national priorities including NAPAs and NAPs;
- Expand on the success or challenges faced by the baseline project of the Government of Zambia's efforts to involve local communities in forest management through the Forest Act No. 4 of 2015;
- Provide more detail on how the project proposes to build capacity at the government and individual level to improve community managed forests and agricultural landscapes;
- Expand on activities to increase local awareness of climate change;
- Expand on the stakeholders involved and the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including how FAO will work at the community level to mitigate any issues between dissenting groups;
- Expand upon how FAO will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how FAO will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that FAO in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

MULTI FOCAL AREA

10. Global (Angola, Belize, Bhutan, Cambodia, Chad, Congo DR, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Madagascar, Namibia, Panama, South Africa): Global Wildlife Program, (World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, WWF-US) GEF ID = 10200

✓ Germany Comments

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but requests that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany welcomes the program, which was designed following a theory of change (TOC) that addresses drivers of habitat loss and wildlife, illegal wildlife crime and lack of wildlife-based land uses. It is appreciated, that one component aims at preserving key wildlife landscapes, enhancing their resilience, and reducing threats to endangered species due to poaching and habitat loss. Enhancing management and resilience of terrestrial and marine protected areas, community, private and state reserves, wildlife corridors and OECMs as well as strengthening political will, policy and governance to connect wildlife habitats at subnational, national and transnational levels are sound and proven to work approaches. It is especially welcomed, that another component aims at promoting wildlife-based and resilient economies (such as nature-based tourism-NBT, sport hunting, legal wildlife trade under CITES and sharing proportion of protected area revenues with local communities).

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- The project should include more explicit explanations and provisions for ensuring compliance with social safeguards that are targeted at preventing human rights abuses through local enforcement agents. This should include provisions for implementing and monitoring of social safeguards as well as mechanisms for participation of local communities in decision-making.
- Although marine conservation and sustainable use are project components, the project seems to be leaving out the massive global problem of illegal fishing (IUU) and sustainable fisheries management. The promotion of sustainable use in fisheries and involving key user groups like fisheries communities in MPA-management is vital for project success. Although marine and coastal areas are mentioned as vital for climate mitigation, it is not pointed out that these areas are important nursery grounds for a variety of fish species and therefore are fundamental for the livelihood of fishing communities. If marine conservation is considered to be vital part of the further project development, Germany would like to request the following points are taken into account:
 - The project should address IUU fishing as of equivalent importance as marine IUCN species illegal wildlife trade since they represent a substantial source of such trade (e.g. shark finning). Therefore, a stronger engagement on the prevention of IUU fishing is considered necessary.

- The project should include participatory co-management through local fishing communities as integral part of Marine Protected Areas management and sustainable fisheries promotion.
- Alternative livelihood options, for both men and women, such as other blue growth opportunities (algae aquaculture) or ecotourism for local communities or vocational training programs are as important.
- Addressing fisheries, the project document should incorporate the implementation of the FAO Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) as well as the FAO-Voluntary Guidelines on Small Scale Fisheries (VGSSF) in their project design.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

As the draft final project document is prepared for CEO endorsement, we urge World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, and WWF-US to:

- Consider the proposed location of the project sites in Indonesia, as all of the proposed sites appear to be located in Sumatra and donors are already doing quite a bit in Sumatra while Kalimantan, Sulawesi, and Papua offer more opportunities for any programmatic work linking conservation with prevention of habitat loss and a less chance of overlap with other donor programs on other islands;
- Expand private sector engagement in Indonesia beyond those that highlight ecotourism as geography and a lack of infrastructure will always be obstacles to really scaling up ecotourism in this area;
- Expand upon how the implementing agencies will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how UNDP will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, and WWF-US in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,

- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

11. Regional (*Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Lucia*): CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multi-country soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems, (FAO) GEF ID = 10195

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but requests that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany welcomes the ambitious approach of integrated landscape management, the proposed development of participatory strategies for the restoration of degraded landscapes, the proposed development of recommendations for improved coordination on soil information and reporting, and that the PIF addresses synergies of the Rio conventions. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that it suggests be addressed in the next phase of finalizing the project proposal:

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

- To ensure an integrated synergetic approach and avoid duplication of efforts, Germany kindly asks to seek close linkages to relevant international stakeholders and processes beyond the GSP, especially regarding the three Rio conventions. For the development of the national and subregional soil information system as well as for capacity building, Germany highly recommends partnering with the land degradation neutrality initiative of the Group on Earth Observations (GEO-LDN). Regarding SLM practices, the project should ensure a close exchange with the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT). In addition to linkages to GSP, the national soil experts should have linkages and ensure synergies with the Rio conventions and other relevant processes.
- The current PIF establishes a direct relationship between data availability and meeting LDN targets. However, the link is not that straight forward - many factors impede the use of data for decision making, e.g. political and human factors that play into decisions, lacking capacity to understand and interpret data, inadequate presentation of the data, mistrust in the quality of the data. The final proposal should elaborate on the approach taken to ensure that data will lead to meeting LDN targets. Applying a user- centered design process based on the principles for digital development will be crucial.

- Germany appreciates the detailed elaboration of outcomes, outputs and indicators. For outcome indicator 3.1 Germany suggest linking it to the national monitoring of SDG indicator 15.3.1. Outcome indicator 5.2 "Number of knowledge and training material disseminated in the region" is not meaningful in terms of outcome, Germany suggests revising this indicator to account for quality and impact of the training material.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As FAO prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge FAO to:

- Explain the process put into place to assist project countries with developing targets through the Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Process (except for Guyana and Grenada);
- Consider streamlining the baseline projects that this proposal intends to expand on, as the current list seems ambitious;
- Expand on how implementation of the project could be impacted by natural disasters and how FAO plans to mitigate this possibility;
- Expand upon how FAO will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how FAO will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities;
- Expand on the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including which specific stakeholder groups were engaged; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that FAO in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned, and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.

12. Timor-Leste IKAN Adapt: Strengthening the adaptive capacity, resilience and biodiversity conservation ability of fisheries and aquaculture-dependent livelihoods in Timor-Leste, (FAO) GEF ID = 10181

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:

Germany welcomes the proposal aiming to enable fisheries and aquaculture stakeholders in Timor-Leste to adapt to climate change and manage biodiversity conservation through reducing vulnerabilities, piloting and adopting new practices and technologies and sharing information and knowledge.

In particular, the approach of systematically addressing climate change adaptation and biodiversity conservation on different levels in the fisheries and aquaculture sector to reduce vulnerability is appreciated. The project design is building up on many relevant interventions in the country (e.g. the EU Pacific-European Union Marine Partnership (PEUMP) Program, the FAO-Timor-Leste program and is seeking synergies with other organizations (e.g. WorldFish Center, Blue Ventures, Coral Triangle Initiative, Conservation International). It is further welcomed that the participatory involvement of local communities and traditional authorities are seen as crucial for the implementation of ecologically sound fisheries management practices and for the identification of potential climate resilient diversified livelihoods. At the same time, Germany has the following comments that should be addressed in the next phase of finalizing the project proposal:

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- While the overarching project objective of increasing the resilience of fisheries and aquaculture stakeholders as well as their sustainable use of natural resources is well displayed, Germany strongly recommends to review component definitions to ensure that outcomes and outputs contribute to the respective components and that outputs are clearly defined.
- For instance, the output title of output 2.1. suggests a focus on resilient livelihood and biodiversity strategies, while the description of what output 2.1 entails then focuses on vulnerability assessments without clearly specifying how these would be translated into community strategies.
- Furthermore, output 2.2 seems to encompass both planning as well as piloting of new technologies. It is suggested to add an additional output in order first focuses on piloting of new technologies.
- The proposal includes an output (3.3) on a project monitoring system. Germany highly recommends reviewing the description of this output, which seems to focus on communication, and provide a more robust M&E strategy in support of

the developed indicators. This would help to ensure that that project goal will be achieved and that adaptive management of the project is ensured.

- While the PIF illustrates how the project is aligned with priority areas of the country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, and National Adaptation Program of Action, Germany recommends to update the respective sections on the policy and legal framework as well as the consistency with national priorities to confirm the project's alignment with the country's Nationally Determined Contribution at the proposal finalization stage.
- While the PIF identifies gender as an important priority and provides some examples of gender considerations could be integrated, Germany welcomes additional references on of how relevant outputs address gender considerations. For instance, output 1.4. foresees the establishment of fishery management councils but does not reveal how the representation of women will be ensured.
- Further, Germany would recommend more specific information on how the project aims to ensure long term sustainability and maintenance of interventions (e.g. scaling up of pilots, capacity development of government officials etc).
- Finally, Germany would encourage to also include in the project proposal references to the FAO-Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries (CCRF) and the FAO-Voluntary Guidelines for Securing Sustainable Small-Scale Fisheries in the Context of Food Security and Poverty Eradication (VGSSF), which both are seen as crucial for the success of the project during the implementation.

✓ **Norway-Denmark Comments**

- The Project Identification Form (PIF) reveals weaknesses and challenges in an array of sectors and areas of the country. The plans seem quite ambitious in the three main project areas - laws and regulations; local community adaption and development; and improvement of institutions' capacity to collect climate and biodiversity data.
- The appraisal suggests several improvements of information, analyses and justification of suggested interventions in the PIF. The appraisal report documents that the applicant/agency is following up on some of these issues.
- It is often not clear to what extent problems and suggested interventions are linked to the presence of anticipated future problems caused by climate change or whether they are part of a broader developmental or historical context.
- The PIF makes due reference to earlier projects of support, including a Norwegian-supported project.

Support to the development and improvement of fisheries and aquaculture management in East Timor, however, seems justified.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF.

As FAO prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement, we urge FAO to:

- Consider how the vulnerability assessment results from this project will contribute to the on-going integrated vulnerability assessment conducted by the Secretary of State for Environment;
- Consider coordination with USAID's Tourism for All project, which is looking at doing similar activity, specifically on sustainable management plan for selected protected area, as well as USAID's mission's efforts in implementation or design phase;
- Expand on the coordination with the NOAA installed buoy gauges mentioned on page 27, as we are of the understanding that all the relevant data including reports and maps for the Interdisciplinary baseline ecosystem assessment surveys to inform ecosystem –based management planning in Timor-Leste were handed over to MAF accordingly;
- Expand upon how FAO will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how FAO will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

In addition, we expect that FAO in the development of its full proposal will:

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations, environmental non-governmental organizations and the private sector in both the development and implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify on how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide feedback on this important PIF. We look forward to seeing our feedback incorporated in the project proposal at the CEO endorsement stage of the process.