



Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia

Basic Information

GEF ID

10174

Countries

Ethiopia

Project Title

Enhancing Adaptive Capacity of communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

UNDP: 5902

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the project is aligned with CCA objectives 1 and 2 linked to **technology transfer** and **climate mainstreaming**. Please refer to comments on question 4 in part II also. It seems the Agency is still referring to CCA Objectives of GEF 6 instead of GEF 7.

The project builds on the past GEF funded adaptation projects in Ethiopia and aligns with the new objectives by focusing on innovative technologies for climate adaptation planning and implementation, integrated approach to systematically address key challenges and enhanced engagement with local communities and private sector.

The Agency may like to review the project title which reads a bit incomplete. An alternative title for agency's consideration is :

Enhancing Adaptive Capacity for communities by up-scaling best practices and adopting an integrated approach in Ethiopia.

It's important to have Ethiopia in the title for easy web search.

April 25: No further comments.

April 29: Thanks for revising the title. Just noticed a small grammatical typo in the previous suggestion. You may like to replace for communities with "**of communities**."

Agency Response

The project title has been changed to reflect the country.

Correct reference to GEF 7 objectives has been made in the PIF

JP, 30Apr - title is revised.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The components, outcomes and outputs are quite comprehensive to meet the program objectives and core indicators. The project proposes to use a set of integrated activities ranging from capacity building and training of institutions; use of digital and advanced technologies e.g. GIS, UAVs; investments in introducing climate resilient technologies and best practices; and livelihood diversification with focus on women, youth and private sector.

The agency is requested to complete the template of core indicators and meta information for LDCF as shared by the GEF Secretariat. Since the core indicators are not yet built in the GEF portal, the agency could submit the information in an Annex. Please refer to the email sent on 3rd April by Gef Secretariat to agencies in this regard.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

The template has been completed and included as an annex.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Three co-financing listed in the table suggests type of co-finance as "unknown at this stage". Please note that this is not an acceptable category. The Agency is requested to indicate the type as it appears in the drop down. The Adaptation fund is, for example, always a grant so it can be specified as that. If the Agency is not sure on the type, it can choose **Other** as an option.

The description of the co-finance identification is not consistent with the table. It refers to a WB co-financing which is not included in the table. Also, no supportive information is provided for other co-financing sources identified.

The agency is requested to modify this section.

April 25: The co-financing by UNDP is categorized as investment mobilized. If it is not a dedicated already planned investment by UNDP, then it should be classified as a recurrent expenditure.

April 29: The co-finance by UNDP is still classified as **grant** instead of recurrent expenditure. As stated earlier, if it's not a dedicated funding in the region and meant to support this project through flexible country budgets, it should be classified as recurrent expenditure. If grant, please elaborate.

Agency Response

The text has been modified to reflect the tabulated sources of co-financing, showing the consultations done among different government Ministries implementing projects from the different funding sources.

JP, 30Apr - reclassified to recurrent expenditure for UNDP line.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the proposed GEF financing is within the limit of total LDCF allocation of \$10 million for Ethiopia for the GEF 7 period.

Agency Response N/A

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response N/A

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response N/A

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the proposed GEF financing is within the limit of total LDCF allocation of \$10 million for Ethiopia for the GEF 7 period.

Agency Response N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

NA

Agency Response N/A

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the PPG requested is within the allowable cap of \$200,000 for FSPs up to \$10 million.

Agency Response N/A

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The Agency is requested to submit the core indicators in a separate document as per the template shared by the GEF Secretariat Adaptation team.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

Core indicators have been submitted in a separate document.

Project/Program taxonomy**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

Agency Response N/A**Part II – Project Justification****1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The project describes well the climate vulnerability in the target region highlighting the increased intensity of climate extremes and increase in mean temperature affecting livelihoods of vulnerable communities. It also highlights the limited adaptive capacities of people to withstand climate shocks due to lack of access to usable climate information and limited knowledge of climate resilient best practices and technologies in agriculture and livestock. It also identifies systemic issues such as lack of integrated planning and climate mainstreaming in national development programs which is restricting climate solutions to scale up in the region. Finally, it acknowledges the gender gap prevalent in the country which further exacerbates the vulnerability of women to climate change.

The project also proposes to target vulnerability of urban areas in the country. The agency is requested to provide a rationale for including urban resilience within the project scope as its link with other project activities is not very apparent.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

Rationale for including urban resilience is now included in the PIF. During stakeholder discussions, it was considered that for effective, scaled up adaptation, the vulnerability of urban communities also need to be taken into consideration, especially given the linkages between some of the small urban settlements and rural communities. There is also significant rural-to-urban migration in Ethiopia, which is increasing urban vulnerability and thus the need to build urban resilience. The planning, mainstreaming and capacity building for integrated approaches, when included for both urban and rural communities will enable the project to have a wider impact. Given that this is the first time to include both rural and urban resilience, the proportion of urban woredas to be included in the project is small.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Several baseline projects have been defined including the national government's Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) strategy and facility which aims to foster a green and resilient growth of the country. CRGE provides a good foundation for integration and scaling up of successes through the proposed project.

The agency is requested to elaborate how the proposed project is built on the past LDCF projects including the Autonomous adaptation project and the PIF approved project titled "Climate Change Adaptation in the Lowland Ecosystems of Ethiopia".

April 25: The baseline projects are described as co-financing projects which is slightly confusing as these projects are not listed in Table C. The agency is requested to ensure consistency in definitions. Other comments have been addressed.

Agency Response

The PIF has been revised to show the logical connection between this proposed project and earlier LDCF projects which have demonstrated the technologies and practices that work at community level, making the selection of such practices simpler without having to go through piloting activities. This enables the proposed project to focus on the activities that scale up adaptation and mainstreams it rather than start from basics. The linkages also avoid duplicating what has already been done or planned to be done through the other LDCF projects. This project is a demonstration of how successive LDCF projects in the same country add value to each other and take adaptation from basic levels to more advanced levels i.e. integrated approaches, proactive involvement of private sector, value chains and addressing vulnerability associated with rural-urban linkages.

JP, 26 Apr 19 - addressed.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the project components and outcomes are described comprehensively. The integrated landscape approach for adaptation planning and intervention and emphasis on access to climate information for better climate risk management are unique aspects of the project.

The project aims to scale up adaptation technologies and best practices implemented under previous adaptation projects in new regions in Ethiopia.

The link of outcomes with CCA 2 (pertaining to climate mainstreaming in national programs and policies) needs to be strengthened. Please refer to comments on question 4 below.

April 24: No further comments.

Agency Response

The PIF has been revised to strengthen project outcomes with climate change mainstreaming into policies at the national level, including the tools and capacity building for such mainstreaming.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The adaptation objectives defined under the Adaptation Benefits correspond to GEF 6 CCA objectives 1 and 2. The Agency is requested to align the project with new CCA objectives under GEF 7. The new CCA objectives are as follows:

CCA-1 Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation

CCA-2 Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact

CCA-3 Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation

Prima facie and as mentioned in comment 1, the project seems to be aligned with CCA 1 and CCA 2 of GEF 7. However, the link with CCA 2 needs to be elaborated more effectively in outcomes descriptions. Please correlate this comment with comments on question 3 above.

The agency needs to revise the project design accordingly.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

The project design has been revised to reflect the new CCA objectives in GEF 7. The link to CCA 2 has also been revised to show how outcomes deliver this GEF 7 objective.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The additional cost reasoning provided is fine and is based on the following:

- The project proposes innovation in terms of using advanced tools in Ethiopian context e.g. GIS, UAVs, and focus on disseminating climate information to communities for effective adaptation planning and climate risk management.
- The integrated landscape approach for adaptation planning is unique and won't be implemented in a BAU scenario.
- Enhanced focus on engaging with women and private sector would be possible only in alternative scenario.

While there are new areas and approaches proposed in the project, the agency is requested to elaborate on why climate adaptation solutions pertaining to agriculture proposed in new areas cannot be implemented without GEF's support. Many of the measures have already been successfully demonstrated in other regions.

April 25: The incremental cost reasoning needs to be defined more upfront. There is some explanation added under one of the outcomes only.

Agency Response

Additional text has been provided in the section on "additional cost reasoning" to show the need for GEF support to vulnerable farmer access to adaptation solutions that have been previously demonstrated in other regions.

JP, 26 Apr 2019 - addressed.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The estimated number of beneficiaries (180,000) seems to be on lower side given the wide geographical scope of the project. The agency is requested to review the estimates again.

The project may also directly contribute to improved land management by focusing on agriculture best practices and integrated landscape planning. Given that it is one of the core indicators, the agency is requested to estimate this core indicator also and include it as part of adaptation benefits.

Please refer to GEFSEC guidance on core indicators for adaptation.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

The estimated number of beneficiaries has been reviewed upwards to 225,000. Land under climate-resilient management has also been included as an indicator.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

There are a number of innovation elements proposed in the project for climate informed decision making. The landscape approach is clearly a step forward building on past adaptation investments in the country.

The alignment of the project with Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy of Ethiopia will potentially support replication of results across the country. The project may benefit by focusing on this link more strongly and therefore the agency is requested to highlight this in the PIF.

The sustainability argument does not seem to be very strong. Especially the argument "profits gained from diversified and climate-resilient livelihoods will increase the sustainability of these livelihoods through the economic viability of approaches introduced through this proposed LDCF project." is vague. The engagement of communities and government in implementation and evidence base is plausible, but not concrete enough in the context of Ethiopia where similar projects have been implemented in the past in different regions. How the experience will be embedded within local and national institutions is not clear. The agency is requested to review the sustainability argument and elaborate more.

April 25: Comments incorporated well. No further comments.

Agency Response

The "Innovation and Sustainability" section of the PIF has been reviewed to strengthen sustainability arguments.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Stakeholder engagement was done with civil society, government and private sector during the design of the project including during the national dialogue of Ethiopia in presence of the GEF Secretariat.

For the implementation, a wide range of national government institutions and civil society organization is proposed to be engaged. However, it is not clear how the project will involve local government and political institutions at woreda or city level for implementation. A number of

projects do not deliver sustainable results due to lack of buy-in and implementation role of local institutions. How will the project ensure that these institutions are engaged and the flow of resources and knowledge is bottom up?

The agency is also encouraged to engage global stakeholders in the project for flow of high quality knowledge and resources in the project. For example, it can engage with Global Center on Adaptation, Global Resilience Partnership, InsuResilience, African Risk Capacity (for risk insurance), other African regional institutions on climate change for exchange of knowledge and experience.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

The stakeholder engagement section of the PIF has been elaborated to provide specific information on how especially local level stakeholders will be engaged, and to identify potential global stakeholders.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Gender is quite well integrated in program design and implementation.

Agency Response N/A

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. The engagement of private sector in business opportunities such as climate information dissemination, risk insurance product design. The project also aims to develop local entrepreneurs with focus on women.

Agency Response N/A

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Risks are identified and mitigation/management strategies are proposed. The Agency is requested to highlight if there is any political risk in program implementation.

April 25: No further comments.

Agency Response

Political and security risk has been highlighted in the PIF

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The coordination of the project with other GEF funded projects and bilateral funding projects e.g. PSNP is described in detail.

Institutional arrangement for management, monitoring and evaluation of the proposed project is not elaborated. The agency is requested to provide details in this regard.

April 25: No further comments. Detailed coordination structure provided in the PIF.

Agency Response

Details of the institutional arrangements have been outlined in the PIF.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. The project is aligned with NAPA and Second National Communication to UNFCCC. It is also aligned with the Climate Resilient green Economy Strategy of Ethiopia.

Agency Response N/A

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes knowledge management is core to the project design. The proposed knowledge centers to be developed at woreda level will ensure sustainable flow of knowledge to local level for effective implementation. The project will also integrate knowledge management under his project with national government's knowledge management initiative under the Climate Resilient and Green Economy strategy.

Agency Response N/A

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The endorsement letter from the GEF OFP in Ethiopia is not attached. The agency is requested to upload the letter. **Please note that this is a mandatory requirement for technical clearance**

mandatory requirement for technical clearance.

April 25: No further comments. Endorsement letter provided.

Agency Response

An endorsement letter reflecting the new title of the project is attached.

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The PIF and the PPG is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

At the time of CEO endorsement, the agency is requested to provide a more detailed assessment of local vulnerability issues and climate change challenges in the 18 woredas and 2 urban areas.

Review Dates

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