

Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah regions

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10180

Countries

Djibouti

Project Name

Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Dikhil and Tadjourah regions

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/5/2019

Review completed by PM

3/5/2020

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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

GEFSEC, 4/9/2019 - Clarification requested. The project has indicated that it is aligned with CCA objectives 1 and 3, however it seems that it also is aligned with CCA-2.

Recommended action: Please consider whether the PIF submission might also align with CCA-2.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. The agency has clarified that the project does not deal with mainstreaming directly.

Agency Response

The project strategy does not directly focus on mainstreaming adaptation (CCA-2) even though the products of the project will support initiatives that aim at mainstreaming adaptation such as the NAP. The project however directly addresses issues around adaptation and EbA implementation and planning (CCA-1 and 3). Table A has been updated to reflect project outcomes' budgets as budget per output is not available at this stage.

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

GEFSEC, 4/9/2019 - More clarification requested. While the activities under each component seem to intuitively make sense, considering the root causes of environmental degradation and adaptation problems in each target area, components 1 and 2 do not seem to cohesively fit together as part of one project. Considering the spatial disconnect and the different issues plaguing Tadjourah ville and the Go'bad Plain, a brief explanation of how this project will be implemented under one approach would be much appreciated. Additionally, the costing of component 2 is roughly double that of component 1. Considering the activities are comparable - a combination of green and grey infrastructure, with agropastoral and EbA interventions, please provide the rationale behind the costing difference.

Recommended action: Please briefly explain how this endeavor will be implemented as one project, considering the differences mentioned above; and please briefly provide the rationale for why component 2 is costed at twice the amount of component 1.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. The agency has clarified a cost-basis justifying the budgeting for components 1 and 2.

Agency Response

The costs of both components have been estimated based on the experience of the LDCF-2 project which showed that the gabion walls that will be built in Tadjourah will be more expensive than the boreholes that will be created in Gobaad.

Both regions were chosen through consultations with national stakeholders as both regions are witnessing high level of climate risks and vulnerabilities and are therefore priorities for climate change adaptation in the country. Those regions have very different characteristics as Gobaad is rural and vulnerable to drought while Tadjourah is urban and vulnerable to flood. They represent the diversity and reality of the country. The project will therefore allow for the collection of lessons learned and good practices on different adaptation interventions that can then be scaled up to cover the rest of the country. In addition, the project will support the development of two adaptation plans, one rural in Gobaad and one urban in Tadjourah. The aim is to support the NAP process in Djibouti. The National Adaptation Plan will incorporate on the findings of these two adaptation plans. Finally, component 3 on knowledge management will link components 1 and 2 by enhancing knowledge and awareness around resilience building in both rural and urban as well as drought and flood prone areas that are representative of the country's reality. This third component on knowledge management will be key to building the project's 'one approach'.

Please refer to highlighted text in table B and section A.1.4

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

GEFSEC, 4/9/2019 - Yes. The indicative co-financing listed in table C is clear and consistent with what is described in the body text of the PIF submission and justified as recurrent expenditures.

Agency Response

Responses to GEF comment GEFSEC, 6/10/2019

GEF comment 1: On co-financing: It is not yet clear how UNEP intends to support the implementation of this project and the achievement of the project objective with the current level of Agency engagement as indicated in the proposed baseline and co-financing.

UNEP intends to support project implementation of the project following the same strategy than for the LDCF 2 project. This will be done through capacity building, learning and exchange of experiences of the project team thanks to:

- Regular missions of the CTA and the UNEP Task manager to the country and the project sites.
- Support to the project's procurement and financial processes with dedicated trainings to the project team from the UNEP Finance officer

- Strengthening performance management of project staff through the development of annual work plan and regular follow-up of performance indicators and means of verification.
- Organization of training workshops for project coordinators with a particular emphasis put on exchange of experiences, learning and sharing of good practices between the teams of the different EbA projects implemented by UN Environment. A first training has been successfully organized by UN Environment in October 2018 in Nairobi, Kenya. It covered some sessions on adaptation and on project management. The goal is to have a similar training every year or two years. Follow-up skype discussions are also organized with the trainers to ensure that lessons learned are integrated in the project coordinator's work and advance the project objectives.
- Organization of regular webinars (three to four times a year) designed by UNEP task managers based on common needs and requests of project teams. Each webinar is the opportunity to discuss a specific issue around project management and climate change adaptation with project teams working with UNEP.
- Communication letters that are developed monthly by UNEP climate change adaptation unit and include a section on suggested readings and latest findings on adaptation to climate change

UNEP will also support the achievement of project objectives by raising the visibility of the project through the design of communication products around project activities and achievements. UN Environment communication expert will work with the project team to develop project factsheets, articles and webpages that will be shared to stakeholders via UN Environment website and communication letters. This will contribute to increasing the profile of adaptation work in Djibouti.

The Knowledge-Sharing Platform for Climate Adaptation named Global Adaptation Network (GAN) will also contribute to the project objectives by providing the opportunity for the project team to:

- Participate to the communities of practices established by the network
- Take online trainings and webinars focusing on key issues such as EbA and preparation and implementation of NAPs in the region
- Get updates on key conclusions coming out of adaptation forums that bring together global experts and typically focus on a small number of key issues in adaptation
- Access useful online resources for adaptation planning and implementation such as the CAKE tool which includes case studies of on-the-ground adaptation efforts, a library of resources to support adaptation work, a community forum with an expert advice column as well as a directory of individuals and organizations rich with adaptation knowledge

GEF comment 2: Additionally, the new adaptation strategy places an importance on systemic impact. Overall, the number of beneficiaries appears to be significantly lower than the majority of GEF-7 LDCF projects that have been technically approved and/or Council-approved. Please indicate the rationale for this and how the project is striving to achieve systemic impact.

Djibouti is a small country with a total population of around one million people including ~ 86,000 inhabitants in the Tadjourah region and ~ 89,000 inhabitants in the Dikhil region (covered by the project).

The project will directly benefit, through component 1, communities in Gobaad plain whose population is estimated at around 10,000 people scattered across the whole rural area. Some are living in small villages others are nomad pastoralists. The 200 households (around 1,400 people) counted in the direct beneficiaries are the families that will directly benefit from the whole package offered by the project including access to water through boreholes with solar pumps, agropastoral plots to grow fodder and food; alternative activities including poultry and small solar powered cold storage for goat milk, women cooperatives or small business; restoration and/or plantation of acacia woodland and installation of woodlots to provide non-timber forest products.

In addition to Gobaad plain, component 1 has been expanded to reach 8 other rural communities of Dikhil and Tadjourah. Based on the recommendations of the LDCF 2 project's mid-term review and the discussions of the project steering committee on the exit strategy, it was recognized that some follow-up activities will be needed to ensure continuity, sustainability and long-term impact of the LDCF 2 project interventions. Output 1.5 has been added to the PIF to provide continued support to productive oasis ecosystems and climate-resilient sustainable livelihoods established and promoted by the LDCF 2 project as well as to facilitate the exchange of experience and lessons learned between the two projects. Additional project sites include the communities of Kouidi Koma, Lilya Bouri and Dinamali in Dikhil as well as Kalaf, Ad Bouya, Darkenle, Sourat and Raysali in Tadjourah and cover a total population of around 280 households (2,200 people) as direct beneficiaries. Specific activities are described in highlighted paragraphs of sections A.1.3 and A.1.4 of the PIF. As a result of this addition, the project budget of component 1 was increased to 3,700,000 usd.

Project beneficiaries of component 1 has doubled due to the addition of output 1.5. Moreover, the number of beneficiaries could be expanded during the PPG phase. Detailed costing will then allow to see if an expansion of project activities to additional villages is possible to cover more beneficiaries.

Direct beneficiaries of component 2 already include the whole Tadjourah urban population (28,000 people) and cannot therefore be further increased.

The limited number of beneficiaries especially in Gobaad plain can be explained by the context (small scattered communities in which significant investments in infrastructure and EbA is required to trigger an impact) and the high cost of activities implementation the country. Experience with the two first LDCF projects implemented in Djibouti (LDCF 1 and 2) showed that the implementation of both engineered and EbA options is costly. This is due to the need to import most of the equipment from abroad, the remoteness of the sites increasing transportation costs and the very small number of national companies that can provide some of the services such as digging boreholes.

The project's strategy for systemic impact is encapsulated in Outcome 3 of the project, which we summarize here:

- developing and implementing national and sub-national campaigns to raise public awareness –
- establishing research programmes on climate change risks and building an evidence base on the cost-effectiveness of various adaptation technologies and sharing the results of this research with policy- and decision-makers, and researchers. These research programmes will link with Djiboutian research institutions and will build on the relevant ongoing research that is being conducted in the country;
- producing and presenting policy briefs on EbA and best-practice adaptation options during NAP policy dialogues, at SCAPE 1&2 multiannual training workshops for decentralised authorities, and through other relevant knowledge sharing platforms.

Component 3 will support the NAP process in the country which is due to start implementation in 2020. The LDCF project’s activities on awareness raising, capacity building and other knowledge generation and knowledge management under this component will support the NAP process as well as contribute to it. For example, the LDCF project will contribute climate risk and vulnerability assessments which will feed into the NAP’s CCA coordination and knowledge sharing mechanisms and guidance materials planned.

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/219 - Yes, see below.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. Djibouti is eligible to access up to USD \$10 million under the current LDCF resource cap.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. The PPG requested is within the allowable cap of USD \$200k for projects up to USD \$10m.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC, 4/9/2019 - As per the email sent out to the Adaptation Task Force on April 3, please utilized the 'Core Indicators and Metadata' spreadsheet which is mandatory to be completed and submitted with LDCF/SCCF PIFs. There are two worksheets (tabs) in the spreadsheet and both tables: Project metadata & Core Indicators **must** be completed for all PIF submissions for the upcoming GEF-7 WP.

Recommended action: Please fill out and upload the Core Indicators spreadsheet onto the roadmap section of the portal. Additionally, please remove the inputs in the GEFTF Core Indicators table on the portal so as to prevent double counting across the GEF trust funds.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. The core indicators and metadata spreadsheets have been filled in and submitted onto the roadmap section of the portal.

Agency Response

This document has been completed, added to the re-submission package and uploaded to the roadmap section of the portal.

Core indicators have been removed from the portal page to avoid double counting across the GEF trust fund

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. The proper keywords are tagged in Table G.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - More information requested. While the root problem is described as a combination of the degradation of wadi ecosystems systems, which are caused by unplanned urban expansion and other related factors, and which cause increased vulnerability to floods and droughts; more clarification regarding the nature of the Gobaad and its' connection to Tadjourah ville would be appreciated.

Recommended action: From the geo-tagged location coordinates provided by the agency, it seems that the Gobaad plain and Tadjourah ville are quite a far distance away from each other. Please provide some basis for how the degradation of the Gobaad wadi impacts Tadjourah ville and/or vice versa, to provide some connection between two seemingly disparate locations.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - The agency has clarified that there is no spatial connection between the two target locations, but rather, they were both chosen because they were both identified as national priorities, and the pilot interventions in both sites will be used to scale up good practices as part of the NAP process.

Agency Response

In both regions, wadi ecosystems degradation is at the center of the problem statement. Despite these similarities, there is no interconnectedness or interdependence between the ecosystem's degradation and vulnerability root causes of Gobaad plain and Tadjourah ville. The rationale for those project sites selection is explained in response to comment 2 (part 1). Both regions are recognized as national priorities. They are representative of the diversity of the Djiboutian context and the lessons learned on the management approaches of those ecosystems in these two different contexts will be used to scale up adaptation good practices across the country. In addition, adaptation plans coming out of the LDCF-2 project will strongly support the NAP process in Djibouti.

Please refer to highlighted text in section A.1.1 and response to comment 2 (part 1).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - More information requested. While it is clear that the proposed LDCF initiative will build on three baseline projects, which aim to improve the livelihoods of agropastoral and urban communities in Djibouti., more details regarding the Re.Pro.Va and SCAPE (or the Projet d'appui a la decentralization) would be appreciated.

Additionally, under the description of the PROGRES project, it indicates that PROGRES will "benefit from the vulnerability assessments conducted under component 1 of the LDCF project." This does not seem to be an appropriate use of LDCF financing, as LDCF financing should be additional to the baseline investment in generating adaptation benefits, as opposed to alleviating costs associated with the baseline investment. Please clarify this point.

Lastly, the text refers to Appendix I, but there does not seem to be any Appendix 1 in the portal submission.

Recommended action: Please provide the main objectives and scope of Re.Pro.Va and Projet d'Appui a la Decentralization, and provide the Appendix 1 that is mentioned in the text which provides detailed links between the baseline and the proposed LDCF project. Please also clarify the point regarding vulnerability assessments.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Clarification requested. It has been noted that the reference to vulnerability assessments in relation to the PROGRES project has been deleted. Appendix 1 has been made available on the roadmap section and the baseline projects section has been updated. However, one question remains - the Re.Pro.Va project is already financing some grey infrastructure, such as microdams and reservoirs, which the LDCF project is also financing.

Recommended action: Please clarify exactly what the additionality of the LDCF financing is in respect to Re.Pro.Va activities in Tadjourah ville. Additionally, SCAPE is still present in Table B & C and elsewhere - please clarify that this is referring to SCAPE 2? The text below seems to indicate that SCAPE was removed, but is this only referring to SCAPE 1?

GEFSEC, 5/2/219 - Cleared. SCAPE 1 will end in 2019 and SCAPE 2 will then begin. Further information on SCAPE 2 will be gathered at PPG and added to the CEO ER. The LDCF project will add adaptation value to Re.Pro.Va interventions by implementing an EbA approach which may, in some cases, involve some grey infrastructure. Through output 1.1, the LDCF project may also influence the design and siting of some of Re.Pro.Va infrastructure measures to ensure that they build adaptive capacities, given expected climate change. The total result will be to enable the Gobaad Plain communities achieve climate change resilience with both the LDCF and co-financing investments.

Agency Response

The current Strategy of Accelerated Growth and Promotion of Employment (SCAPE) is ending this year (2015-2019) and was therefore not included as a co-financing source in the PIF. SCAPE 2 is currently under development and will be adopted in the coming months. Projet d'Appui à la Décentralisation is a new convention signed in 2019 between Djibouti and the European Union to support the implementation of SCAPE 1 and 2. More information on this new strategy and the related convention (Projet d'Appui à la Décentralisation) will be available during the PPG phase.

Additional information on Re.Pro.Va has been added to the PIF. Please refer to highlighted text in section A.1.2. Both projects will be implemented in Gobaad Plain and will complement each other. The main additionality that the proposed LDCF project will bring is its ecosystem-based adaptation approach that will support the main objectives of the Re.Pro.Va (building resilience to droughts by improving sustainable access to water and supporting agropastoral livelihoods). EbA practices will complement the construction of hydraulic infrastructure, development of agro-pastoral areas and the support of climate resilient agricultural practices initiated by the Re.Pro.Va.

References to climate risk and vulnerability analysis as an additionality of the LDCF project to the PROGRESS project has been deleted. The co-financing strategy follows the updated policy on co-financing.

Appendix 1 'Links between the baseline projects and the proposed LDCF project' is included in the word version of the PIF and will be uploaded in the portal submission.

Response April 26, 2019

The distribution of co-financing per component has been modified. Please refer to highlighted text on co-financing plan in table B and in section A.1.4. (additional cost reasoning). All other tables have been adapted accordingly. Re-Pro-Va and PROGRES that are mostly focused on rural communities provide co-financing to component 1 (Gobaad Plain) while the project Appui à la decentralization provides co-financing to both components 1 and 2 (Tadjourah Ville). Finally, all of the co-financing projects have some activities on knowledge and awareness raising and will therefore also provide co-financing to component 3.

The LDCF project will add adaptation value to Re.Pro.Va interventions by implementing an EbA approach which may, in some cases, involve some grey infrastructure. Through output 1.1, the LDCF project may also influence the design and siting of some of Re.Pro.Va infrastructure measures to ensure that they build adaptive capacities, given expected climate change. The total result will be to enable the Gobaad Plain communities achieve climate change resilience with both the LDCF and co-financing investments.

SCAPE 1 is still ongoing until the end of 2019 and will then be replaced by SCAPE 2 that is currently under development. To be noted that references to SCAPE 1 remain in the PIF because the follow-on strategy (SCAPE 2) is still being designed and because it is an important baseline planning process into which this project can mainstream adaptation. Further information on SCAPE 2 will be added during the PPG phase once more details will be made available by the government. Reference to SCAPE in table B has been replaced by SCAPE 1&2 (please refer to highlighted text).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Somewhat. Please refer to Part 1, Item 2.

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Cleared. The alternative scenario is well described, demonstrating the design of the project, which aims to implement a combination of complementary adaptation strategies to restore wadi ecosystems and reduce flood-related risks and vulnerability in the two target areas.

Agency Response

Please refer to response to Part 1, item 2.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Somewhat. Please see Part 1, Item 1.

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - This item is cleared.

Agency Response

Please refer to response to Part 1, item 1

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Somewhat, but some details regarding the baseline initiatives which are providing co-financing need some more detail - please refer to Part 1, Item 2.

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Cleared, the agency has provided further details on the additional cost reasoning. The business as usual scenario is described for each component, providing a strong basis on which the adaptation scenario is also described and justified.

Agency Response

Please refer to response to Part 2, Item 2

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - The adaptation benefits of the proposed intervention are clear, however some of the project structure and additional cost reasoning need to be clarified further.

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Cleared. The agency has clarified previous concerns regarding co-financing, additionality, and how the project aims to deliver adaptation benefits within the context of the baseline scenario. The project interventions, such as the planting of 400 hectares of acacia trees, livelihood diversification and drought-resilient agriculture will provide numerous tangible benefits including: i) buffering against extreme climate events; ii) reducing soil erosion; iii) improving and maintaining water quality; iv) increasing water supply by increasing infiltration and promoting water conservation; vi) improving food security; and viii) decreasing incidences of disease. As a result of project interventions, there will be ~28,000 direct beneficiaries in Tadjourah Ville whose livelihoods will be less affected by floods. In Gobaad Plain, which has a population of ~10,000 people, an estimated 200 agropastoral families – located in various villages – will directly benefit from improved access to water. Further stakeholder engagements during the project development phase will be used to select the villages and identify the precise number of beneficiary households. The number of indirect beneficiaries in the Tadjourah and Dikhil regions is estimated at ~86,000 and ~89,000 people, respectively.

Agency Response

Please refer to responses to Part 2, item 2 and Part 1, item 1, 2 and 6. Please also refer to highlighted text on co-financing rationale and plan included in each component's baseline and adaptation scenario of section A.1.4 (additional cost reasoning).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. The combined use of grey and green infrastructure with an EbA approach are innovative for Djibouti, while also applying a dual approach which integrates implementation NAPA priorities with NAP elements. The integration of measures meant to support medium and longer term adaptation planning at multiple levels through various capacity building exercises (including training) lends itself to sustainability and replication.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. A preliminary geo-reference on the two target locations is provided.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - More information requested. While the PIF submission indicates that further stakeholder engagement will be undertaken during PPG, and a partial list of stakeholders is provided, more detail would be appreciated. The portal submission indicates more information is included in Appendix 2, which could not be immediately located, and the stakeholders section indicates that CSOs, private sector, and Indigenous Peoples were consulted during project identification but there are no details regarding which specific groups were consulted.

Recommended action: Please upload Appendix 2 onto the portal for easy access and provided further detail, if available, of the "school", CSOs, private sector, and Indigenous Peoples groups that were consulted.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. Indicative information regarding stakeholder engagement has been provided and is sufficient for this stage of project development. Appendix 2 has been added to the roadmap section.

Agency Response

The stakeholder section of the PIF does not specify that CSOs, private sector and indigenous people were consulted during project identification. Consultations at the PIF stage targeted mainly national and local authorities as well as the Gobaad local cooperative, the center of research CERD and existing LDCF projects teams. Details were added on the different meetings that took place during the PIF development. Please refer to highlighted text in stakeholder section. It is highlighted in the stakeholder section that those initial stakeholder meetings will be complemented with wider stakeholder consultations that will be organized during the PPG phase.

The table of Appendix 2 is included in the word version of the PIF and will be uploaded in the portal during resubmission. The table in Appendix 2 provides and indicative list of stakeholders highlighting the role they could play during the PPG phase. Title and table updated. Please refer to highlighted text.

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. Indicative information regarding the project's efforts to ensure gender equality across its activities is included and the submission indicates that a gender gap analysis and further efforts to define the scope and consideration of gender will be undertaken at PPG.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. Existing cooperatives and small businesses involved in agropastoral activities will be strengthened/supported through Component 2 of the proposed projects in their efforts to contribute to adaptation ambitions; in particular, women's groups will receive training and equipment for climate-resilient income-generating activities including poultry raising and cold storage for goat milk.

Agency Response

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Clarification requested. Please indicate if there are any fiduciary risks and how they might be mitigated.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. Fiduciary risk has been added to the risk table and the risk matrix is sufficiently developed for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

UN Environment has been supporting Government of Djibouti to manage fiduciary risks through the last two LDCF projects (LDCF-1 and LDCF-2 projects). Experience has shown that the Government of Djibouti is capable of high delivery rate though support is needed to ensure good fiduciary management. A fiduciary risk management plan will be developed during the PPG phase based on lessons learned of the LDCF-1 and 2 projects. The fiduciary risk and its associated mitigation measures have been added to the risk table of section A.4. Please refer to highlighted text.

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - More information requested.

There are currently 2 additional LDCF-financed projects in addition to the LDCF 2 project - one coastal zone project and one in the mountainous regions of Djibouti. While the geographic scope may be a bit different, please indicate if the project team has communicated with those respective project teams in the event there are any lessons to learned/shared. Additionally, there are two adaptation projects in the GCF pipeline - one focusing on EWS and the other reducing flood impacts on transport corridors for vulnerable agro-pastoralist communities. Please indicate whether there is active coordination with the project proponents of these two proposed GCF projects, as there may be some overlap and/or relevance.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared, as per information provided below and in the edited text.

Agency Response

Discussions with the teams of the LDCF projects were conducted during the development of the PIF that was directly informed by lessons learned of those ongoing projects on various activities including climate resilient livelihood practices (poultry, agriculture...), construction of boreholes and gabion walls...

The Ministry of Urbanism, Habitat, Environmental and Land-use Planning through its Directorate of Land Management and Environment (MHUE/DATE) recently set-up a coordination mechanism with its adaptation projects (LDCF projects and one completed Adaptation Fund project). The deputy director of the MHUE/DATE holds on a monthly basis a coordination meeting to deepen collaboration/synergies within the projects. There is a willingness to further enhance lessons learnt between the different projects with potential regional common workshops to be organized as well as common communication strategy plan. Coordination with projects including an adaptation component and managed outside of the MHUE/DATE will be ensured through regular Project Steering Committee meetings including different ministries and stakeholders working on adaptation in different sectors. This more global coordination could however be further strengthened with the creation of a coordination mechanism for climate change adaptation projects. This could be added as an activity under component 3 during the PPG phase. Coordination efforts could also be complemented based on Djibouti LDCF-2 lessons learned by bilateral meetings between adaptation project teams on regular basis looking at day-to-day project execution and exchange of good practices and lessons learned. This will be further developed in the Prodoc.

Please refer to highlighted text in section A.1.2 (baseline projects), A.2 (stakeholders) and A.5 (coordination).

Reference to both GCF projects in the pipeline have been briefly added in coordination section (A.5). Further information has been requested to the Government of Djibouti and will be added in the Prodoc (during PPG phase)

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

GEFSEC, 4/9/2019 - One clarification requested. The agency has indicated that the project is aligned with Djibouti's Vision 2035 sustainable development plan and the first operational deployment of this plan - the current Strategy of Accelerated Growth and Promotion Employment (SCAPE). The project also responds to Djibouti's NAPA priorities 1,3, and 5; and is coordinating with UNDP on the GCF-financed readiness proposal for Djibouti. The project will inform and coordinate directly with the ongoing NAP process.

Clarification: Are there any current or forthcoming national climate change policies that are not related to the UNFCCC? If so, please elaborate.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. Forthcoming climate change policies are under development and will be added during the PPG phase.

Agency Response

Information on potential forthcoming climate change policies has been requested to the Government of Djibouti. Short description will be added, if relevant, in the Prodoc during PPG phase.

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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. This project encompasses a strong KM dimension, which is evident across all three components. The project will capture and share knowledge generated by the first two components through activities under the third component, which is dedicated to knowledge management and awareness raising.

Agency Response

Part 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

GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - There does not seem to be a letter of endorsement from the Djiboutian OFP on the roadmap section for this project.

Recommended action: Please upload the LOE onto the roadmap section of the portal.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. An LOE from the current OFP has been uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal.

Agency Response

Updated Letter of Endorsement dated from 04/04/2019 was added to the re-submission package. Please refer to roadmap section of the portal.

As advised the project title has been changed to: Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville

May 07, 2019

Responses for the section below (GEFSEC DECISION) have been made in the GEF portal at the various sections. Also the the UNEP Response review matrix providing the details have been attached.

June 10, 2019: Responses for the section below (GEFSEC DECISION):

- On co-financing: It is not yet clear how UNEP intends to support the implementation of this project and the achievement of the project objective with the current level of Agency engagement as indicated in the proposed baseline and co-financing.

UNEP intends to support project implementation of the project following the same strategy than for the LDCF 2 project. This will be done through capacity building, learning and exchange of experiences of the project team thanks to:

- Regular missions of the CTA and the UNEP Task manager to the country and the project sites.
- Support to the project's procurement and financial processes with dedicated trainings to the project team from the UNEP Finance officer
- Strengthening performance management of project staff through the development of annual work plan and regular follow-up of performance indicators and means of verification.
- Organization of training workshops for project coordinators with a particular emphasis put on exchange of experiences, learning and sharing of good practices between the teams of the different EbA projects implemented by UN Environment. A first training has been successfully organized by UN Environment in October

2018 in Nairobi, Kenya. It covered some sessions on adaptation and on project management. The goal is to have a similar training every year or two years. Follow-up skype discussions are also organized with the trainers to ensure that lessons learned are integrated in the project coordinator's work and advance the project objectives.

- Organization of regular webinars (three to four times a year) designed by UNEP task managers based on common needs and requests of project teams. Each webinar is the opportunity to discuss a specific issue around project management and climate change adaptation with project teams working with UNEP.
- Communication letters that are developed monthly by UNEP climate change adaptation unit and include a section on suggested readings and latest findings on adaptation to climate change

UNEP will also support the achievement of project objectives by raising the visibility of the project through the design of communication products around project activities and achievements. UN Environment communication expert will work with the project team to develop project factsheets, articles and webpages that will be shared to stakeholders via UN Environment website and communication letters. This will contribute to increasing the profile of adaptation work in Djibouti.

The Knowledge-Sharing Platform for Climate Adaptation named Global Adaptation Network (GAN) will also contribute to the project objectives by providing the opportunity for the project team to:

- Participate to the communities of practices established by the network
- Take online trainings and webinars focusing on key issues such as EbA and preparation and implementation of NAPs in the region
- Get updates on key conclusions coming out of adaptation forums that bring together global experts and typically focus on a small number of key issues in adaptation
- Access useful online resources for adaptation planning and implementation such as the CAKE tool which includes case studies of on-the-ground adaptation efforts, a library of resources to support adaptation work, a community forum with an expert advice column as well as a directory of individuals and organizations rich with adaptation knowledge

- Additionally, the new adaptation strategy places an importance on systemic impact. Overall, the number of beneficiaries appears to be significantly lower than the majority of GEF-7 LDCF projects that have been technically approved and/or Council-approved. Please indicate the rationale for this and how the project is striving to achieve systemic impact.

Djibouti is a small country with a total population of around one million people including ~ 86,000 inhabitants in the Tadjourah region and ~ 89,000 inhabitants in the Dikhil region (covered by the project).

The project will directly benefit, through component 1, communities in Gobaad plain whose population is estimated at around 10,000 people scattered across the whole rural area. Some are living in small villages others are nomad pastoralists. The 200 households (around 1,400 people) counted in the direct beneficiaries are the

families that will directly benefit from the whole package offered by the project including access to water through boreholes with solar pumps, agropastoral plots to grow fodder and food; alternative activities including poultry and small solar powered cold storage for goat milk, women cooperatives or small business; restoration and/or plantation of acacia woodland and installation of woodlots to provide non-timber forest products.

In addition to Gobaad plain, component 1 has been expanded to reach 8 other rural communities of Dikhil and Tadjourah. Based on the recommendations of the LDCF 2 project's mid-term review and the discussions of the project steering committee on the exit strategy, it was recognized that some follow-up activities will be needed to ensure continuity, sustainability and long-term impact of the LDCF 2 project interventions. Output 1.5 has been added to the PIF to provide continued support to productive oasis ecosystems and climate-resilient sustainable livelihoods established and promoted by the LDCF 2 project as well as to facilitate the exchange of experience and lessons learned between the two projects. Additional project sites include the communities of Kouidi Koma, Lilya Bouri and Dinamali in Dikhil as well as Kalaf, Ad Bouya, Darkenle, Sourat and Raysali in Tadjourah and cover a total population of around 280 households (2,200 people) as direct beneficiaries. Specific activities are described in highlighted paragraphs of sections A.1.3 and A.1.4 of the PIF. As a result of this addition, the project budget of component 1 was increased to 3,700,000 usd.

Project beneficiaries of component 1 has doubled due to the addition of output 1.5. Moreover, the number of beneficiaries could be expanded during the PPG phase. Detailed costing will then allow to see if an expansion of project activities to additional villages is possible to cover more beneficiaries.

Direct beneficiaries of component 2 already include the whole Tadjourah urban population (28,000 people) and cannot therefore be further increased.

The limited number of beneficiaries especially in Gobaad plain can be explained by the context (small scattered communities in which significant investments in infrastructure and EbA is required to trigger an impact) and the high cost of activities implementation the country. Experience with the two first LDCF projects implemented in Djibouti (LDCF 1 and 2) showed that the implementation of both engineered and EbA options is costly. This is due to the need to import most of the equipment from abroad, the remoteness of the sites increasing transportation costs and the very small number of national companies that can provide some of the services such as digging boreholes.

The project's strategy for systemic impact is encapsulated in Outcome 3 of the project, which we summarize here:

- developing and implementing national and sub-national campaigns to raise public awareness –
- establishing research programmes on climate change risks and building an evidence base on the cost-effectiveness of various adaptation technologies and sharing the results of this research with policy- and decision-makers, and researchers. These research programmes will link with Djiboutian research institutions and will build on the relevant ongoing research that is being conducted in the country;
- producing and presenting policy briefs on EbA and best-practice adaptation options during NAP policy dialogues, at SCAPE 1&2 multiannual training workshops for decentralised authorities, and through other relevant knowledge sharing platforms.

Component 3 will support the NAP process in the country which is due to start implementation in 2020. The LDCF project's activities on awareness raising, capacity building and other knowledge generation and knowledge management under this component will support the NAP process as well as contribute to it. For example, the

LDCF project will contribute climate risk and vulnerability assessments which will feed into the NAP's CCA coordination and knowledge sharing mechanisms and guidance materials planned.

October 31, 2019 UNEP responses to GEF comments of 10/11/2019:

- On co-financing: The Secretariat appreciates the additional explanation provided above, however, the information regarding communication and knowledge sharing activities does not provide a clear or compelling basis on agency engagement for effective project implementation in light of UNEP's very low financial commitment in this instance. Please provide further information on the coordination mechanism between this project and the LDCF-2 project, and/or additional details on UNEP's physical presence in country in light of the low co-financing contributed by UNEP to this project.

UNEP response:

Additional 1,000,000 usd of co-financing has been added to the PIF: 800,000 usd coming from the GCF NAP project developed by UNDP together with the Ministry of Environment and that will contribute to the LDCF project effectiveness, impacts and sustainability; the remaining 200,000 usd coming from in-kind co-financing from the local authorities of Dikhil and Tadjourah regions including staff time and office space. Those new co-financing sources bring the total amount of co-financing to 13,125,000 usd. The co-financing ratio is therefore about 1 = 1.5.

UNEP business model works on the basis of national execution modality. UNEP task manager collaborate closely with the project team and the government to build capacity throughout project implementation. Additional technical support is provided by the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), an international adaptation expert dedicating about 60 days per year to the project. Regular missions of the UNEP TM and project CTA are conducted to the project sites. This business model allows UNEP to build national capacities for execution, thus strengthening the longer-term capacity of governments to manage their adaptation planning processes and funds. As such, UNEP's commitment is not borne from the amount of funds spent in the country but by its mandate to deliver UNEP Programme of Work in the adaptation sphere, in which progress on EbA at the national level is a key part. The secretariat is invited to speak to the Djibouti OFP to get feedback on UNEP's level of engagement on the LDCF-2 project and the impact it has had on project delivery.

- On systemic impact/beneficiaries: The justification provided adequately demonstrates how this project will have systemic impact at the institutional level, namely through the support provided for the NAP process. However, the new number of beneficiaries is not clear and the Core Indicators spreadsheet has not been updated. Please take into consideration that while the NAP elements of this project are appreciated, the LDCF's priority is to support vulnerable communities, and the requested amount of nearly \$10 million to support less than 50,000 beneficiaries (the new number has not been indicated, but the original figure was 28k) offers very low impact for dollars spent in comparison to other projects. Please consider either providing more justification, adding additional communities, or decreasing the requested amount.

UNEP response:

Some changes have been made to the result framework including the extension of the climate risk and vulnerability studies and the adaptation planning activities to the regions of Dikhil and Tadjourah. This led to a sharp increase in the number of project's direct beneficiaries that now include the total number of inhabitants of both targeted regions amounting to a total of 207,306 people representing 20% of the country's total population. In addition, an activity has been added to component 3 on facilitating a training workshop on the development of regional/city climate risk and vulnerability assessments and adaptation plan for local authorities (both regional and municipal) of the remaining 3 regions of the country including Ali Sabieh, Arta, Obock and Djibouti Ville. The event will be the opportunity for Tadjourah and Dikhil local authorities to present the results of their CRVA studies and adaptation plans and share their experience. This brings the number of indirect beneficiaries up to 1,048,999 (100% of country population).

In addition to those increase in direct and indirect beneficiaries, a table of benchmark unit costs of the different grey and green adaptation interventions has been developed based on the experience of the LDCF project currently under implementation in the country. As explained in previous response sheets, due to the remoteness and difficult environment as well as the lack of expertise and equipment in-country, the costs of adaptation interventions are particularly high in the Djiboutian context. Based on specific examples coming from past projects unit costs have been calculated (for more information please refer to table in below Annex). Results are as follow:

- Dyke: 78 usd per beneficiary
- Equipped borehole: between 361 usd and 1,533 usd per beneficiary
- Agro-pastoral irrigated plot: 950 usd per beneficiary
- Artificial water retention: 733 usd per beneficiary
- Underground water tank: 286 usd per beneficiary
- Acacia restoration (5ha): 662 usd per beneficiary
- Mangrove restoration (3ha): 752 usd per beneficiary
- Alternative livelihood activity such as aviculture: 229 usd per beneficiary

Because costs of infrastructure and EbA activities are often incompressible/fixed, the unit cost is highly dependent on the size of the community in which the activity is implemented. However, in the Djibouti context, especially when working in rural areas, communities tend to be scattered and small. The size varies between 70 and 700 people per community for the LDCF-2 project currently under implementation. Those communities are however the poorest and most vulnerable to climate impacts.

Project impact will be multiplied thanks to planning, knowledge generation and capacity building activities that will build an evidence base and support iterative adaptation planning and effective implementation of adaptation priorities in the country as well as raise awareness on the importance of ecosystems in adaptation strategies. The impact will also be sustained as all products and training supported by the LDCF project will feed into and contribute to the NAP process that will be starting end of 2020.

Annex 1: Analysis of unit cost intervention of the project ‘Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti’s Dikhil and Tadjourah regions’

| Interventions | Average costs based on projects LDCF-2 | Number of direct beneficiaries | Unit Cost | Comments |
|----------------------|--|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Dyke (digue) | Dyke construction = 1.495.000 usd Studies = 56,500 usd Total cost = 1.551.500 usd | Length 1800 m Height 3 m Width 5 m Protect the Marsaki area of Tadjourah Ville ~ 20,000 people | 78 usd per beneficiary | Based on the experience of the Marsaki Dyke in the LDCF-2 project Unit cost will vary according to the localization of the hard infrastructure and therefore the number of beneficiaries directly protected |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Boreholes (forages) | Borehole = 146,000 usd Pomp and solar panels= 115,000 usd Studies = 13,000 usd Guard = 9,600 usd Total = 283,600 usd | Ad Bouya: 230 inhabitants + 50 nomads Kalaf : 735 inhabitants + 50 nomads Koudi Koma : 135 inhabitants + 50 nomads | Ad Bouya = 1,012 usd per beneficiary Kalaf = 361 per beneficiary Koudi Koma = 1533 usd per beneficiary | Based on the examples of Ad Bouya, Kalaf, Koudi Koma in the LDCF-2 project The costs of an equipped borehole are fixed and amount to around 283,600 usd. The unit cost will therefore vary according to the size of the beneficiary community. In Djibouti rural areas communities are scattered and small. They are however the poorest and most vulnerable to drought. |
| Irrigated agro-pastoral plot (périmètre irrigué) | Construction cost = 384,195 usd Study = 15,000 usd Total cost = 399,195 usd | 60 households = 60 * 7 = 420 beneficiaries | 950 usd per beneficiary | Based on the agro-pastoral plot of 10 ha constructed in Kalaf by the LDCF-2 project Include 3 km of water pipes, 2 water tanks of 150 m3 and 10 hectares of fence |

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Artificial water retention (retenue d'eau) | Estimates = 165,000 usd | 75 inhabitants in Dinamali + 150 nomads Total = 225 beneficiaries | 733 usd per beneficiary | This is based on the estimates done for the LDCF-2 project in Dinamali (Dikhil) for a retention of 20,000 m ³ of water. Could support small scale agriculture around 7-8 months per year. Could support livestock. Water quality will be low and could limit domestic consumption. |
| Underground water tank (citerne enterrée) | Estimates = 20,000 usd | 10 households = 70 beneficiaries | 286 usd per beneficiary | This is based on the estimates done for the LDCF-2 project in Dinamali (Dikhil) for 100 m ³ of water. This option will only support domestic consumption not agriculture or livestock due to the small amount of water captured. |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Acacia restoration (reforestation acacia) | 5ha fence = 38,000 usd nursery = 23,500 usd nursery worker = 30,000 usd (for 1 year) 2 guards (for 1 year) = 4,800 usd 3 workers on site (for 1 year) = 7200 usd Bags and seeds = 10,000 usd Training and replantation work = 3000 * 3 = 9000 usd Total cost = 122,500 usd | Koudi Koma 135 inhabitants + 50 nomads Total beneficiaries = 185 | 662 usd per beneficiary | Based on the example of Koudi Koma restoration of 5ha acacia trees by the LDCF-2 project. |
| Mangrove restoration (reforestation mangrove) | 3ha Fence: 21,500 usd Nursery 26,500 Assistant = 18,000 usd Bags and seeds = 15,000 usd Guards = 14,400 usd Consultant = 2500 usd Supervision mission 15,000 usd Total cost = 112,900 usd | Raysali 100 beneficiaries + 50 nomads Total beneficiaries = 150 | 752 usd per beneficiary | Based on the example of Raysali in the LDCF-2 project. |
| Aviculture | Equipment 30,000 Consultant 10,000 usd total cost = 40,000 usd | 25 households = 175 beneficiaries | 229 usd per beneficiary | Based on estimates made for this activity in the LDCF project in Ad Bouya and Kalaf |

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Agency Response

14 April 2020 Responses to GEF comment 4/13/2020

1. 1. The target of direct number of beneficiaries has been removed from GEF core indicator 11 and target of areas of land restored has been removed from GEF core indicator 3 to avoid double counting as both targets are included into the CCA core indicator worksheet.

2. 2. Name of co-financier has been updated accordingly for the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) with the Green Climate Fund (GCF)

3. 3. The ESERN has been included in Annex 3 of the PIF and the following paragraph has been integrated to the risk section of the PIF (please refer to yellow highlights):

In addition to the above risk screening, the UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN) was developed (Annex 3). It assesses the preliminary overall risk as medium and highlights specific risks that will need to be further analyzed and mitigation strategies that will need to be detailed during the PPG phase. Those include:

- The risk of increased water consumption due to the promotion of agricultural activities that will be maintain through water management practices and drought-resilient agricultural techniques as well as an increased water recharge and catchment supported by ecosystems restoration

- The risk linked to potential negative impacts of dams and other hard infrastructure promoted by the project to reduce flood risk in Tadjourah and support water catchment and recharge in Dikhil. Those risks will be reduced by looking at lessons learned from past experiences and conducting systematic Environmental Impact Assessments and other studies as necessary

- The risk of triggering some movements of population especially regarding temporary settlements of pastoralists near newly constructed boreholes to access water during the hot season. The impact of those movements will have to be further analysed during the PPG phase to ensure that it does not lead to increased tensions between or within communities

- The risk linked to the creation of new restrictions on land use to protect and conserve key wadi ecosystems. This will be limited by the engagement of communities and their leaders in setting up those restrictions and the promotion and support of key alternative livelihood options by the project.

- The risk to affect traditional livelihoods or development priorities as set by the communities by promoting alternative livelihoods (agriculture, aviculture, woodlot) to traditional pastoralism that is highly challenged by climate change.

- The risk to provide unequal economic benefits to a limited group of people will be limited by the community-led identification of beneficiaries for livelihood activities based on interest and availability as well as the promotion of wide ecosystems restoration interventions and infrastructure that will provide long-term undifferentiated benefit to the community or city / neighborhood at large.

3 MARCH 2020 - RESPONSE to GEF COMMENT, 2/24/2020

RESPONSE to GEFSEC, 2/24/2020 - Not cleared. What PPO is requesting is a brief explanation in the section underneath Table C under the heading "Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified" that explains in plain words how the four other initiatives providing co-financing that is labeled as "investment mobilized" is, in fact, investment mobilized -- as in, not recurrent expenditure (i.e. results in the creation or acquisition of a fixed or financial asset). The description and details relating to those projects providing co-financing is appreciated, but the details in question are relating specifically to how the Agency is categorizing the four initiatives as investment mobilized. For further clarification, please refer to the Co-financing Guidelines

UNEP RESPONSE

The GEF Co-financing Guidelines (Policy: FI/GN/01) approved on June 26, 2018 define Investment Mobilized as any Co-Financing not classified as recurrent expenditures. As such the amount selected as co-financing are expenditure linked to implementation of key activities in Djibouti and therefore focused on the creation or acquisition of fixed or financial assets as opposed to recurrent expenditures. They can be considered as parallel co-finance coming from key international donors including IFAD, the European Union and the Green Climate Fund as part of the four following projects:

- **The Programme for Water and Soil Management (PROGRES)** funded by IFAD in 2017 for 7 years. The identified investment mobilized linked to this project amount to 625,000 usd and focus on i) capacity-building, ii) construction of key infrastructure, iii) implementation of EbA activities including reforestation and protection of vegetation in order to improve livelihood conditions and reduce poverty among rural agropastoral communities in Dikhil and Tadjourah (regions targeted by the LDCF project).
- **The Projet d'appui à la resilience des populations rurales – project Re.Pro.Va** funded by the European Union in 2017 for 5 years. The identified investment mobilized linked to this project amount to 6,000,000 usd and focus on i) the construction and rehabilitation of hydraulic infrastructures, ii) development of agro-pastoral areas, iii) breeding activities for short-cycle species and agricultural production, iv) awareness raising and training activities in agricultural production and nutrition in order to promote resilience of rural population to drought and climate change in Tadjourah and Dikhil (regions targeted by the LDCF project).

- **The Projet d'appui à la décentralisation** funded by the European Union from 2019 to 2024. The identified investment mobilized linked to this project amount to 5,400,000 usd and focus on supporting the implementation of local authorities' annual investment plans (including key infrastructure, economic activities as well as EbA activities) as well as institutional strengthening and capacity building in order to reduce poverty and improve livelihood conditions in the context of climate change in regions targeted by the LDCF project.
- The **National Adaptation Planning project** funded by the GCF starting in 2020 with the objective of enhancing adaptation planning at all levels through a wide range of activities including: strengthening the capacities of the National Committee on Climate Change; establishing a knowledge platform to support coordination and coherence of adaptation planning; conducting climate risk impacts and risks assessment in the sectors of agriculture, livestock, tourism and coastal zones; Identifying and prioritizing adaptation options; strengthening the ministry of environment planning and budgeting tools; supporting CCA integration into key policies, regional planning and local priorities; designing a CCA M&E framework as well as; adding a climate change layer to the existing finance tracking database.

A comprehensive review of the GEF Policy: FI/GN/01 on co-financing show that there does not seem to be any restriction regarding needing to identify specific fixed or financial assets supported by co-financing expenditure as a condition of 'investment mobilised'. This information is available in the co-financing section p10-12 of the PIF.

19 FEBRUARY 2020 - RESPONSE to GEF PPO COMMENTS

RESPONSES TO GEF SEC 11/14/2019 GEF PPO had indicated that the explanation on how investment mobilized was identified is still insufficient – it only makes reference to UNEP's co-financing leaving the other co-financers that provide investment mobilized with no comprehensive explanation on how these were identified – **please provide a meaningful explanation of how the co-financing constitutes as investment mobilized**

UNEP RESPONSE

The co-financing plan includes four baseline projects that are described in detail in the co-financing sub-section p10 of the PIF.

Those four identified co-financing sources are:

- **The Programme for Water and Soil Management (PROGRES)** funded by IFAD and the Ministry of Agriculture in 2017 for 7 years to improve livelihood conditions and reduce poverty among rural agropastoral communities in Dikhil and Tadjourah (regions targeted by the LDCF project).
- **The Projet d'appui à la resilience des populations rurales – project Re.Pro.Va** funded by the European Union in 2017 for 5 years to promote resilience of rural population to drought and climate change by enhancing the livelihoods of agropastoral populations in the five regions of Djibouti including Tadjourah and Dikhil (regions targeted by the LDCF project).

- **The Projet d'appui à la décentralisation** funded by the European Union from 2019 to 2024 aiming at strengthening the decentralization process to reduce poverty and improve livelihood conditions in rural and urban areas including in regions targeted by the LDCF project
- The **National Adaptation Planning project** funded by the GCF starting in 2020 with the objective of enhancing adaptation planning at all levels

Funds coming from those initiatives will support the implementation of the LDCF project and the achievement of its objectives and should therefore be considered as co-financing according to GEF guidelines. The LDCF project will build on and complement those baseline initiatives.

For example, the proposed LDCF project will build on and complement PROGRES' activities in Gobaad Plain in several ways. EbA interventions will be implemented in selected sites where PROGRES is investing in hard infrastructures; at these sites the added value of EbA in terms of reduced climate change vulnerability will be documented. Interventions will include reforestation along the wadi banks to improve groundwater recharge^[1] and gabion walls to reduce erosion and subsequent sedimentation downstream. A similar co-financing rationale is presented for the **Projet d'appui à la resilience des populations rurales** – project **Re.Pro.Va**. The LDCF project will build on the activities of SCAPE and Projet d'Appui a la Decentralisation in urban and rural areas by providing a climate lens to planning processing. Lastly, the project will contribute climate change risk information and support national adaptation planning which will complement, add value to and at the same time be galvanized by the NAP planning project.

For more information on sources, amounts and justification, please refer to PIF section on co-financing p10. This rationale will also be further detailed during the PPG phase.

[1] Ilstedt, U., Tobella, A.B., Bazié, H.R., Bayala, J., Verbeeten, E., Nyberg, G., Sanou, J., Benegas, L., Murdiyarso, D., Laudon, H. and Sheil, D., 2016. Intermediate tree cover can maximize groundwater recharge in the seasonally dry tropics. *Scientific reports*, 6.

13 NOVEMBER 2019

RESPONSES TO GEF SEC 11/12/2019

Letter of Endorsement revised according to comments attached in the portal. Amounts on the portal submission match what is in the LOE. There is a clear breakdown in the LOE labeled for the amount and what exactly is being endorsed (project financing, PPG and agency fees).

12 NOVEMBER 2019

RESPONSES TO GEF PPO, 11/11/2019

1) The fee request in the LoE is lower than the combined requested Agency fee in Portal – please either adjust or to request a new LoE.

New LoE signed by the government is attached in the document section of the GEF portal

2) On Co-financing: some of the in-kind co-financing has been marked as “investment mobilized”. However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf. In this context, the explanation on how investment mobilized was identified is insufficient – please amend both as appropriate.

This as been changed on the GEF portal and revised PIF. Please see yellow highlights on p5 of the revised PIF.

3) Section 6. Coordination: there is no explanation / description about the institutional structure of the project – please provide a comprehensive answer and please remember that agencies may not serve in executing functions in any way unless there is written justification sent by the OFP.

The following paragraph has been added to the coordination section of the PIF (please refer to yellow highlights on p31).

“The proposed LDCF project will be implemented by a Project Management Unit (PMU) headed by a national project coordinator supported by an administrative assistant, a finance officer and an international Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). The PMU will be hosted and supervised by the Directorate of Land Management and Environment (MHUE/DATE) of the Ministry of Urbanism, Habitat, Environmental and Land-use Planning that is the project Executing Entity. Human resources, financial management, procurement, technical work, coordination as well as reporting will be led by the PMU and supervised by the executing entity with UNEP support and guidance when required. Synergies on administrative and financial issues with other projects under implementation will be facilitated by the MHUE/DATE to save time and resources when possible. Given the size of the project, we will be looking carefully during the PPG phase at options to design the country level execution structure to deliver higher amounts of funds. We confirm that UNEP will not serve in an executing role.

As the project Implementing Agency, UNEP will provide oversight, capacity building and training to the project team to promote efficient and effective implementation and achieve high impact. The national project coordinator, the CTA and the UNEP task manager will work in close collaboration through coordination meetings held every two weeks and regular supervisory missions to project sites”.

01 NOVEMBER 2019

RESPONSES TO GEFSEC, 10/11/2019 GEFSEC DECISION RECOMMENDATION COMMENTS (Also attached)

- On co-financing: The Secretariat appreciates the additional explanation provided above, however, the information regarding communication and knowledge sharing activities does not provide a clear or compelling basis on agency engagement for effective project implementation in light of UNEP's very

low financial commitment in this instance. Please provide further information on the coordination mechanism between this project and the LDCF-2 project, and/or additional details on UNEP's physical presence in country in light of the low co-financing contributed by UNEP to this project.

UNEP response:

Additional 1,000,000 usd of co-financing has been added to the PIF: 800,000 usd coming from the GCF NAP project developed by UNDP together with the Ministry of Environment and that will contribute to the LDCF project effectiveness, impacts and sustainability; the remaining 200,000 usd coming from in-kind co-financing from the local authorities of Dikhil and Tadjourah regions including staff time and office space. Those new co-financing sources bring the total amount of co-financing to 13,125,000 usd. The co-financing ratio is therefore about 1 = 1.5.

UNEP's GEF LDCF business model works on the basis of national execution modality. UNEP's task manager collaborates closely with the project team and the government to build capacity throughout project implementation. Additional technical support is provided by the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), an international adaptation expert dedicating about 60 days per year to the project. Regular missions of the UNEP TM and project CTA are conducted to the project sites. This business model allows UNEP to build national capacities for execution, thus strengthening the longer-term capacity of governments to manage their adaptation planning processes and funds. As such, UNEP's commitment is not borne from the amount of funds spent in the country but by its mandate to deliver UNEP Programme of Work in the adaptation sphere, in which progress on EbA at the national level is a key part. The secretariat is invited to speak to the Djibouti OFP to get feedback on UNEP's level of engagement on the LDCF-2 project and the impact it has had on project delivery.

- On systemic impact/beneficiaries: The justification provided adequately demonstrates how this project will have systemic impact at the institutional level, namely through the support provided for the NAP process. However, the new number of beneficiaries is not clear and the Core Indicators spreadsheet has not been updated. Please take into consideration that while the NAP elements of this project are appreciated, the LDCF's priority is to support vulnerable communities, and the requested amount of nearly \$10 million to support less than 50,000 beneficiaries (the new number has not been indicated, but the original figure was 28k) offers very low impact for dollars spent in comparison to other projects. Please consider either providing more justification, adding additional communities, or decreasing the requested amount.

UNEP response:

Some changes have been made to the result framework including the extension of the climate risk and vulnerability studies and the adaptation planning activities to the regions of Dikhil and Tadjourah. This led to a sharp increase in the number of project's direct beneficiaries that now include the total number of inhabitants of both targeted regions amounting to a total of 207,306 people representing 20% of the country's total population. In addition, an activity has been added to component 3 on facilitating a training workshop on the development of regional/city climate risk and vulnerability assessments and adaptation plan for local authorities (both regional and municipal) of the remaining 3 regions of the country including Ali Sabieh, Arta, Obock and Djibouti Ville. The event will be the opportunity for Tadjourah and

Dikhil local authorities to present the results of their CRVA studies and adaptation plans and share their experience. This brings the number of indirect beneficiaries up to 1,048,999 (100% of country population).

In addition to those increase in direct and indirect beneficiaries, a table of benchmark unit costs of the different grey and green adaptation interventions has been developed based on the experience of the LDCF project currently under implementation in the country. As explained in previous response sheets, due to the remoteness and difficult environment as well as the lack of expertise and equipment in-country, the costs of adaptation interventions are particularly high in the Djiboutian context. Based on specific examples coming from past projects unit costs have been calculated (for more information please refer to table attached). Results are as follow:

- Dyke: 78 usd per beneficiary
- Equipped borehole: between 361 usd and 1,533 usd per beneficiary
- Agro-pastoral irrigated plot: 950 usd per beneficiary
- Artificial water retention: 733 usd per beneficiary
- Underground water tank: 286 usd per beneficiary
- Acacia restoration (5ha): 662 usd per beneficiary
- Mangrove restoration (3ha): 752 usd per beneficiary
- Alternative livelihood activity such as aviculture: 229 usd per beneficiary

Because costs of infrastructure and EbA activities are often incompressible/fixed, the unit cost is highly dependent on the size of the community in which the activity is implemented. However, in the Djibouti context, especially when working in rural areas, communities tend to be scattered and small. The size varies between 70 and 700 people per community for the LDCF-2 project currently under implementation. Those communities are however the poorest and most vulnerable to climate impacts.

Project impact will be multiplied thanks to planning, knowledge generation and capacity building activities that will build an evidence base and support iterative adaptation planning and effective implementation of adaptation priorities in the country as well as raise awareness on the importance of ecosystems in adaptation strategies. The impact will also be sustained as all products and training supported by the LDCF project will feed into and contribute to the NAP process that will be starting end of 2020.

Annex 1: Analysis of unit cost intervention of the project ‘Planning and implementing Ecosystem based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti’s Dikhil and Tadjourah regions’

| Interventions | Average costs based on projects LDCF-2 | Number of direct beneficiaries | Unit Cost | Comments |
|----------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Dyke (digue) | Dyke construction = 1.495.000 usd Studies = 56,500 usd Total cost = 1.551.500 usd | Lenght 1800 m Height 3 m Width 5 m Protect the Marsaki area of Tadjourah Ville ~ 20,000 people | 78 usd per beneficiary | Based on the experience of the Marsaki Dyke in the LDCF-2 project Unit cost will vary according to the localization of the hard infrastructure and therefore the number of beneficiaries directly protected |
| Boreholes (forages) | Borehole = 146,000 usd Pomp and solar panels= 115,000 usd Studies = 13,000 usd Guard = 9,600 usd Total = 283,600 usd | Ad Bouya: 230 inhabitants + 50 nomads Kalaf : 735 inhabitants + 50 nomads Koudi Koma : 135 inhabitants + 50 nomads | Ad Bouya = 1,012 usd per beneficiary Kalaf = 361 per beneficiary Koudi Koma = 1533 usd per beneficiary | Based on the examples of Ad Bouya, Kalaf, Koudi Koma in the LDCF-2 project The costs of an equipped borehole are fixed and amount to around 283,600 usd. The unit cost will therefore vary according to the size of the beneficiary community. In Djibouti rural areas communities are scattered and small. They are however the poorest and most vulnerable to drought. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|---|
| Irrigated agopastoral plot (périmètre irrigué) | Construction cost = 384,195 usd Study = 15,000 usd Total cost = 399,195 usd | 60 households = 60 * 7 = 420 beneficiaries | 950 usd per beneficiary | Based on the agropastoral plot of 10 ha constructed in Kalaf by the LDCF-2 project Include 3 km of water pipes, 2 water tanks of 150 m ³ and 10 hectares of fence |
| Artificial water retention (retenue d'eau) | Estimates = 165,000 usd | 75 inhabitants in Dinamali + 150 nomads Total = 225 beneficiaries | 733 usd per beneficiary | This is based on the estimates done for the LDCF-2 project in Dinamali (Dikhil) for a retention of 20,000 m ³ of water. Could support small scale agriculture around 7-8 months per year. Could support livestock. Water quality will be low and could limit domestic consumption. |
| Underground water tank (citerne enterrée) | Estimates = 20,000 usd | 10 households = 70 beneficiaries | 286 usd per beneficiary | This is based on the estimates done for the LDCF-2 project in Dinamali (Dikhil) for 100 m ³ of water. This option will only support domestic consumption not agriculture or livestock due to the small amount of water captured. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Acacia restoration (reforestation acacia)</p> | <p>5ha fence = 38,000 usd nursery = 23,500 usd nursery worker = 30,000 usd (for 1 year) 2 guards (for 1 year) = 4,800 usd 3 workers on site (for 1 year) = 7200 usd Bags and seeds = 10,000 usd Training and replantation work = 3000 * 3 = 9000 usd Total cost = 122,500 usd</p> | <p>Koudi Koma 135 inhabitants + 50 nomads Total beneficiaries = 185</p> | <p>662 usd per beneficiary</p> | <p>Based on the example of Koudi Koma restoration of 5ha acacia trees by the LDCF-2 project.</p> |
| <p>Mangrove restoration (reforestation mangrove)</p> | <p>3ha Fence: 21,500 usd Nursery 26,500 Assistant = 18,000 usd Bags and seeds = 15,000 usd Guards = 14,400 usd Consultant = 2500 usd Supervision mission 15,000 usd Total cost = 112,900 usd</p> | <p>Raysali 100 beneficiaries + 50 nomads Total beneficiaries = 150</p> | <p>752 usd per beneficiary</p> | <p>Based on the example of Raysali in the LDCF-2 project.</p> |
| <p>Aviculture</p> | <p>Equipment 30,000 Consultant 10,000 usd total cost = 40,000 usd</p> | <p>25 households = 175 beneficiaries</p> | <p>229 usd per beneficiary</p> | <p>Based on estimates made for this activity in the LDCF project in Ad Bouya and Kalaf</p> |

GEFSEC 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

5/2/2019 - A portal glitch seems to have deleted all the comments from the three previous reviews here. The agency was asked to consider changing the name of this project, which initially referred to KM, so as to more accurately reflect actual project activities - which it did. Additionally, the agency was asked to ensure that the grant request amount, inclusive of all fees and PPG, was under the \$10 million limit, which is also reflected in the current submission. At this time, the agency has adequately responded to Secretariat comments for this stage of project development and this project is being recommended for consideration into the June 2019 LDCF work program.

GEFSEC, 5/6/2019 - The secretariat would like to request clarification for the following comments:

- Please indicate in Table C, what the sources of co-financing are. For example, Re.Pro.Va is being financed by the European Union's European Development Fund, but this is not indicated in Table C. Please write the source for each entry in Table C.

This has been added.

- UNEP is not providing any co-financing whatsoever. Please clarify why this is the case.

This was an oversight. A co-financing initiative has been added.

- Please clarify why all co-financing is labeled as recurrent expenditure. As per the GEF co-financing policy and the generally standard **Recurrent expenditure** on goods and services is **expenditure**, which does not result in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets (new or second-hand). It consists mainly of **expenditure** on wages, salaries and supplements, purchases of goods and services and consumption of fixed capital (depreciation). From the description of the baseline investments which are providing co-financing to the proposed LDCF initiative, it does seem that some fixed assets will be created. Please clarify if this is the case and re-label the co-financing as accurate.

This has been corrected to Grant. As the PIF explains, all three Components of the project build on and integrate the investments made in the three investment projects.

- **Beneficiaries** - In comparison with other investments requesting a similar level of financing from the LDCF, this initiative seems to be benefiting a relatively low number of people. Please provide some justification for the value-for-money and/or why this figure is low, and/or adjust the target number accordingly.

The number of direct beneficiaries is estimated to be ~28,200 direct beneficiaries[1] in Tadjourah Ville and the Gobaad Plain. The number of indirect beneficiaries in the Tadjourah and Dikhil regions is estimated at ~86,000 and ~89,000 people, respectively. These are numbers that correspond to UN Environment's experience of implementing projects in Djibouti where operational costs are high due to small market size and remoteness.

GEFSEC, 5/7/2019 - These comments have been cleared. A portal glitch has again deleted all the comments made in this box. The agency has addressed the Secretariat's comments by: 1) Labeling all the sources of co-financing in Table C; 2) correcting an oversight omission of co-financing being provided by UNEP totalling \$100k; 3) Correcting the type of co-financing provided from recurrent expenditure to investment mobilized; and 4) Provided some basis justifying the low number of beneficiaries due to the high operational costs in Djibouti, combined with small market size and remote project sites.

GEFSEC, 6/10/2019 - The Secretariat remains concerned about the two following points:

- On co-financing: It is not yet clear how UNEP intends to support the implementation of this project and the achievement of the project objective with the current level of Agency engagement as indicated in the proposed baseline and co-financing.
- Additionally, the new adaptation strategy places an importance on systemic impact. Overall, the number of beneficiaries appears to be significantly lower than the majority of GEF-7 LDCF projects that have been technically approved and/or Council-approved. Please indicate the rationale for this and how the project is striving to achieve systemic impact.

The Secretariat remains available for discussion on the above points.

GEFSEC, 10/11/2019 - The Secretariat would like to receive clarification on the above points

- On co-financing: The Secretariat appreciates the additional explanation provided above, however, the information regarding communication and knowledge sharing activities does not provide a clear or compelling basis on agency engagement for effective project implementation in light of UNEP's very low financial commitment in this instance. Please provide further information on the coordination mechanism between this project and the LDCF-2 project, and/or additional details on UNEP's physical presence in country in light of the low co-financing contributed by UNEP to this project.
- On systemic impact/beneficiaries: The justification provided adequately demonstrates how this project will have systemic impact at the institutional level, namely through the support provided for the NAP process. However, the new number of beneficiaries is not clear and the Core Indicators spreadsheet has not been updated. Please take into consideration that while the NAP elements of this project are appreciated, the LDCF's priority is to support vulnerable communities, and the requested amount of nearly \$10 million to support less than 50,000 beneficiaries (the new number has not been indicated, but the original figure was 28k) offers very low impact for dollars spent in comparison to other projects. Please consider either providing more justification, adding additional communities, or decreasing the requested amount.

GEFSEC, 11/11/2019 - The above two comments have been cleared.

GEF PPO has reviewed this project and has flagged a few comments for consideration. Once these have been addressed and resubmit for consideration, pending resource availability.

- 1) The fee request in the LoE is lower than the combined requested Agency fee in Portal – please either adjust or to request a new LoE.
- 2) On Co-financing: some of the in-kind co-financing has been marked as “investment mobilized”. However, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf. In this context, the explanation on how investment mobilized was identified is insufficient – please amend both as appropriate.
- 3) Section 6. Coordination: there is no explanation / description about the institutional structure of the project – please provide a comprehensive answer and please remember that agencies may not serve in executing functions in any way unless there is written justification sent by the OFP.

GEFSEC, 11/12/2019 - **NOT CLEARED**

The endorsement letter amount does not match what is in the portal. The project financing in Tables A,B, and D in the portal submission reads "**8,925,000.**" The endorsement letter table indicates the GEF project financing is "9,125,000." While the total amount matches, the amounts requested for the project financing, PPG, and fees do not match. Furthermore, the table must clearly indicate the amount for project financing, the amount for PPG, and the amount for agency fees (PPG fee and project agency fee can be combined here, up to the agency's discretion).

Please resubmit ensuring the amounts on the portal submission match what is in the LOE, and with a clear breakdown in the LOE labeled for the amount and what exactly is being endorsed (project financing, PPG, fees).

GEFSEC, 11/13/2019 - Cleared. A new LOE has been uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal.

GEFSEC, 11/14/2019 - GEF PPO had indicated that the explanation on how investment mobilized was identified is still insufficient – it only makes reference to UNEP’s co-financing leaving the other co-financers that provide investment mobilized with no comprehensive explanation on how these were identified – **please provide a meaningful explanation of how the co-financing constitutes as investment mobilized.**

GEFSEC, 2/24/2020 - Not cleared. What PPO is requesting is a brief explanation in the section underneath Table C under the heading "**Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified**" that explains in plain words how the four other initiatives providing co-financing that is labeled as "investment mobilized" is, in fact, investment mobilized -- as in, not recurrent expenditure (i.e. results in the creation or acquisition of a fixed or financial asset). The description and details relating to those projects providing co-financing is appreciated, but the details in question are relating specifically to how the Agency is categorizing the four initiatives as investment mobilized. For further clarification, please refer to the Co-financing Guidelines:

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf

GEFSEC, 3/5/2020 - Cleared by GPU.

GEFSEC, 4/13/2020 - Several policy comments below to address for consideration:

- 1) To avoid double counting, please remove the target for GEF core indicator 11, since they have already been reported on the CCA core indicator worksheet.
- 2) Co-financing: "Name of Co-Financier" field (National Adaptation Plan), please provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated.
- 3) Section 5 of the PIF show that some risks screening has taken place, but at this stage, please provide the completed UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN) and/or indicate more clearly the preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as the types and risk classification of any identified risks and impacts including any preliminary measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

GEFSEC, 4/14/2020 -

- 1) Cleared.
- 2) Cleared.
- 3) Cleared.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Please submit an updated LOE reflecting the updated project grant amount at CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The project, *Planning and Implementing Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in Djibouti's Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville* (GEF ID 10180), aims to increase the capacity of local communities in Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville to adapt to climate change. The proposed LDCF project will address climate vulnerabilities within a complex socio-economic environment through providing evidence-based knowledge of climate change impacts and best-practice adaptation options in Gobaad Plain and Tadjourah Ville. The socio-economic and environmental benefits of project interventions will be monitored to inform the NAP process in Djibouti. Benefits will be achieved through: i) implementing adaptation technologies including both green and grey technologies ii) training local communities on adaptation technologies using a learning-by-doing approach; iii) improving evidence-based knowledge on climate change impacts and on cost-effective adaptation options in Djibouti; and iv) increasing awareness of the national and local government staff, and local communities on climate change adaptation and adaptation opportunities. The information collected from monitoring the benefits will be used to identify relevant adaptation technologies to guide regional policies in the target communities. Adaptation interventions such as the planting of 400 hectares of acacia trees, livelihood diversification and drought-resilient agriculture will provide numerous tangible benefits including: i) buffering against extreme climate events; ii) reducing soil erosion; iii) improving and maintaining water quality; iv) increasing water supply by increasing infiltration and promoting water conservation; vi) improving food security; and viii) decreasing incidences of disease. The project will directly benefit 207,306 direct beneficiaries; and place 440 hectares of land under more climate resilient management. The project will also train 550 people and produce 30 land use community plans and 2 regional adaptation plans.

