



GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

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

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): Reducing Vulnerability and Increasing Resilience to Climate Change through Promoting Innovation, Transfer and Large-Scale Deployment of Adaptation-Oriented Technologies in Priority Agriculture Value-Chains and Creating Jobs; Agency: UNIDO; GEF Project Financing: \$8,932,420 (GEF ID 10377).....	1
2.	Guinea: Increased Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Most Vulnerable Communities to Climate Change in Forested Guinea; Agency: UNDP; GEF Project Financing: \$8,850,000 (GEF ID 10160)	3
3.	Myanmar: RICE-Adapt: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Farming Communities in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River Basins; Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$8,932,420 (GEF ID 10395).....	5
4.	Sudan: Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur; Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$2,429,680 (GEF ID 10159).....	7
5.	Malawi: Malawi-Climate Resilient and Sustainable Capture Fisheries, Aquaculture Development and Watershed Management; Agency: AfDB; GEF Project Financing: \$4,416,210 (GEF ID 10411)	8
6.	Mali: Resilient, Productive and Sustainable Landscapes in Mali's Kayes Region; Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$2,271,406 (GEF ID 16 10362).....	10
7.	South Sudan: Watershed Approaches for Climate Resilience in Agro-Pastoral Landscapes; Agencies: UNDP and UNIDO; GEF Project Financing: \$8,471,461 (GEF ID 10178)	12
8.	Tanzania: Building Resilience through Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation in Dodoma; Agency: AfDB; GEF Project Financing: \$3,759,000 (GEF ID 10418)	14
9.	Vanuatu: Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu – Phase II (VCAP II); Agency: UNDP; GEF Project Financing: \$6,720,020 (GEF ID: 10415).....	15

**DECEMBER 2019 LDCF/SCCF WORK PROGRAM:
COMMENTS FROM COUNCIL MEMBERS
(REFERENCE: LDCF/SCCF.C.27)**

1. Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC): Reducing Vulnerability and Increasing Resilience to Climate Change through Promoting Innovation, Transfer and Large-Scale Deployment of Adaptation-Oriented Technologies in Priority Agriculture Value-Chains and Creating Jobs; Agency: UNIDO; GEF Project Financing: \$8,932,420 (GEF ID 10377)

✓ *Germany Comments*

Germany requests that the Secretariat sends draft final project documents for Council review four weeks prior to CEO endorsement.

Germany welcomes this project which has the ambitious cross-sectoral objective to scale up adaptation technologies in one of the most vulnerable countries to climate change. The involvement of the private sector, including MSMEs and financial institutions, is particularly welcome. Linkages between national adaptation planning processes and the project's interventions are also encouraged. However, Germany requests the following issues to be addressed in the final project proposal.

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

- Given that a substantial part of the co-financing comes from private sector entities including banks (USD 15 million) and SMEs (USD 5 million) and that amounts are still to be confirmed, Germany would welcome further information on:
 - How these amounts have been estimated and how much has been secured,
 - Why equity is deemed to be the right financial instrument for SMEs finance, given their substantial appetite for private debt.
- Germany asks to refine the analysis of present and future climate impacts at the national level (and sub-national if possible). Current and future climate-related impacts on the target sectors agriculture, water and energy should be precisely identified. Information on how climate change is affecting the target vulnerable populations (Indigenous peoples, women, poor farmers) is necessary to achieve sustainable and durable adaptation and development outcomes. The GIZ Climate Expert Tool could be used to assess impacts of potential investees.
- As the project's scope is still broad regarding sectors and technologies, Germany would welcome the following clarifications:

- Supported technologies under component 1: although selection criteria will be elaborated during the project, some narrowing-down indications should be provided to know which technologies are going to be prioritized (e.g. stage of commercialization, risk level, scale-up potential);
- Linkages with NAPA: Germany recommends to clearly define and present which supported technologies have adaptation-benefits, and which only have co-benefits. (section 1.A.2).
- Germany also recommends including more information on vulnerable target groups in component 2, as training and awareness-raising needs differ for each.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Expand on how the project will deal with personnel changes – both within the government and implementing partners – as the project moves forward.
- Provide more detail on how the proposal plans to address any issues of limited capacity that arise, based on the complexity of the project.
- Expand on activities to increase local awareness of climate change;
- Generally expand on the successes or challenges faced by the various projects that this proposals seeks to build upon;
- Provide more detail on how the project proposes to build capacity at the government and individual level;

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

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

2. **Guinea: Increased Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Most Vulnerable Communities to Climate Change in Forested Guinea; Agency: UNDP; GEF Project Financing: \$8,850,000 (GEF ID 10160)**

✓ *France Comments*

- France wishes to raise the following points:
 - The **additionality** of the project's component 1 compared to the other existing projects in Guinean Forest, as mentioned in the document, is not obvious despite the search for complementarity. The innovation brought by this project seems mainly to be its approach of agriculture from the angle of climate change adaptation, with agricultural solutions already recognized and implemented via other projects. Component 1 also seems to focus on the use of improved seeds, with less interest in other CSA techniques (although a component concerns a CSA technology package to be implemented, but without any real analysis at this stage, either on the content and the area concerned). The lack of hydroclimatic data on the region also limits the justification for an adaptation project. The choice of the intervention area thus begs question (is forest Guinea more vulnerable to climate change than the rest of the country?)
 - **Stakeholders** have been consulted, but it is difficult to judge their level of support for the project, which is essential for its implementation. The project does plan for community participation, which should enable to meet the specific expectations of the different groups. The need for the project, however, is unclear at this point.
 - **Education** is not covered, other than by ad hoc training of producers. The evolution of an agricultural system, which requires a real cultural change, also needs programs in training centers (existing or to be created) in order to have a long-term effect.
 - The **environmental impact** of improved seeds, different farming practices and agricultural inputs should be assessed, as well as the environmental benefits of the project (soil quality, deforestation, etc.). No monitoring indicator seems to be proposed for the project.
 - The financial component is interesting and could bring real added value to the agricultural sector by setting up **financial mechanisms** for investments in climate change adaptation / mitigation.

❖ (Note that translation in English from French is by the GEF Secretariat)

✓ *Germany Comments*

Germany welcomes the proposal, which promotes localised climate-smart solutions to increase climate resilience in the agricultural sector. Furthermore, Germany appreciates the supplementary outputs regarding strengthening local microfinance and climate information services. In addition, Germany lauds that the project focuses on particular

aspects of the NAP process in Guinea. With its comprehensive rationale and sound theory of change, Germany sees potential for scalability.

Germany provides the following suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- Germany appreciates the focus on context-specific CSA solutions. To further strengthen this aspect, Germany proposes to explore in more detail how community-based organisations will be involved in the selection and implementation of technologies applied under output 1.2. in order to ensure local buy-in and ownership beyond project duration.
- Germany encourages consideration of local administrations and their relationships with each other and with communities. These relationships could be flashpoint for conflict, hampering the project's successful implementation. Familiarization with local administrations and communities could help to mitigate such friction. A more detailed assessment of this issue in the "stakeholder engagement" and "risk" sections of the document would be helpful.
- Similarly, Germany recommends to assess the risks related to the weaknesses of public structures and administrations in remote locations of Guinea, and identify potential mitigation options e.g. capacity building measures.
- Germany notes the risk posed by lack of infrastructure in, and remote location of, the area of intervention. Germany recommends assessing the risks this poses in the risk section, and detail potential mitigating activities such as through infrastructure and roadway development initiatives.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Align project outputs with outcome 1. It is unclear how vulnerable communities specifically will be addressed, as opposed to all communities.
- Expand on how Guinea uniquely experiences gender vulnerabilities and why it is important to address them in order to adapt to climate change;
- Expand on how the project will promote a positive bias toward women and ensure the gender balance goals of specific outputs (for example, outputs 2.2 and 2.3);
- Provide detail on how the most vulnerable farmers and communities are selected;
- Expand on how this project is in line with national priorities including NAPAs and NAPs;

- Expand on the stakeholders involved and the particulars of stakeholder consultations planned, including how UNDP will work at the community level to mitigate any issues between dissenting groups;
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate with other, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

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

- Provide more information on how women specifically have been involved in the development of the project proposal and how they could be engaged in the implementation of the program; and,
- Clarify how the implementing agency and its partners will communicate results, lessons learned, and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project.

3. Myanmar: RICE-Adapt: Promoting Climate-Resilient Livelihoods in Rice-Farming Communities in the lower Ayeyarwady and Sittaung River Basins; Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$8,932,420 (GEF ID 10395)

✓ *Germany Comments*

Germany generally welcomes the project, as it provides a strong adaptation justification of current and future climate impacts. The project is well aligned with national priorities and policies and has a strong up scaling potential, as it aims to disseminate climate-resilient agriculture practices and technologies to other regions and countries, including through the development of private-sector links for market integration. However, there are several issues, which Germany requests to be revised in the final project document.

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

Stakeholder engagement and knowledge management:

- Germany would welcome a clearer definition of the current engagement with and profile of the targeted vulnerable farming communities.
- Germany kindly asks to specify whether and how these stakeholders were consulted and informed throughout the project preparation, and consequently, to what extent they (i) are aware; and (ii) support the project.
- Germany kindly asks to revise the training aspects and knowledge sharing component to account for the target communities' respective education and literacy levels. This is crucial to ensure their understanding and effective dissemination.
- Germany would welcome additional information regarding the climate

education centers, especially on how the private sector is to be involved.

Gender:

- Germany asks to review the project document as to include gender-sensitive indicators and concrete measures about how to foster a gender-based approach
- Barriers to female engagement, as well as associated exclusion risks should be defined in the planned gender analysis and addressed through concrete measures.

Adaptation of "theory of change":

- The full proposal should concretely identify and quantify how the outputs under component 2 and 3 will be designed to specifically target resilience and adaptivity of rice producing communities and how the planned outputs under component 3 will be translated into corresponding interventions in the field.
- The specific climate relevance of the outputs listed under component 2 (e.g. integrated pest and nutrition management) and component 3 (e.g. 1 strengthened capacities and performance of agricultural cooperatives) should be clarified.

Follow-on financing and private sector participation:

- In general, the role of the private sector in the project should be described more clearly, and should specifically identify potential conflicts of interests between environmental and economic benefits. If possible, this analysis should be disaggregated to each producer and value chain actor, and each output.
- This analysis should be used for engagement with private actors and to inform a private-sector strategy. It should be more explicitly formulated how private stakeholders can be mobilized beyond project completion.
- Given the resource challenges the government is facing, a proper exit strategy is necessary. This applies especially to the proposed climate change education centre, which currently lacks a sustainable business model.

Synergies with bilateral projects:

- It should be formulated how the experiences of ongoing private sector-based projects will be taken into account to enhance sustainable access to premium rice market seeds, as well as delivering financial services to farmers and value chain actors.
- Germany would invite FAO to consult with the BMZ/EU project "Myanmar Sustainable Aquaculture Program", as fisheries is one value chain for the diversification strategy.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Please consider the success and lessons learned from previous USAID programs in addressing gender barriers, such as their focus on seed production for women farmers in creating market opportunities;
- Please provide additional information that takes into account the risks to ecosystem sustainability, biodiversity, and potential changes in farming practice leading to alteration of current landscapes;
- Consider the implications of the ability of agricultural systems to mitigate GHG emissions and provide secondary income streams combined with the potential introduction of secondary farming activities (i.e., alternative livelihoods) related to potential aquaculture; and
- Consider the possibility of exporting the adaptative capacity of this project to other regions with similar linkages in the political and economic mapping of those regions.

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

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

4. Sudan: Resilience of Pastoral and Farming Communities to Climate Change in North Darfur; Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$2,429,680 (GEF ID 10159)

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal which aims to reduce climate vulnerability of pastoral and farming communities along the migratory routes in North Darfur, applying a strong focus on gender.

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

- Germany welcomes the strong rationale for the project that (i) clearly sets out

the interrelation between resource competition, restricted pastoralist mobility, exacerbating effects of degradation and climate change, as well as (ii) clearly identifies barriers that need to be addressed. Germany nevertheless recommends including a more detailed account of the Theory of Change (ToC) that reflects how these barriers are addressed at output and outcome level and to include concrete indicators for all components.

- The project description includes more detailed information but lacks specific linkage to the ToC as well as concrete indicators and measures. For example, Voluntary Guidelines on Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT) are highlighted as innovative and participatory tools to increase community resilience; they constitute one of the core elements of the proposal. However, VGGT are not explicitly referred to in the ToC; Therefore, Germany highly recommends including a more detailed account of the theory of change at output and outcome level and directly link these levels with indicators that allow to immediately understand how they reflect the overall objectives.
- Working with communities to reduce conflicts is an important component of the project and critical for success (see outcome indicator 1). Against this backdrop, the proposal would benefit from a detailed description of stakeholder engagement and participation at the current stage, instead of expanding that in the PPG phase.
- While important and innovative aspects are described in the rationale and emphasis is laid on e.g. the importance of social protection, social capital, water resource management, and financial coping strategies, this is so far not all-inclusively considered in the project design. In order to realize the full potential of the project, Germany recommends to take a more holistic approach. For instance, by combining climate-smart agriculture with diversification of livelihoods or elaborating on risk transfer mechanisms such as disaster risk finance and insurance instead of only using the network of the insurance facility African Risk Capacity as stated in the proposal.

5. Malawi: Malawi-Climate Resilient and Sustainable Capture Fisheries, Aquaculture Development and Watershed Management; Agency: AfDB; GEF Project Financing: \$4,416,210 (GEF ID 10411)

✓ **Germany Comments**

Suggestions for improvement being made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- Germany welcomes that the proposed project seeks synergies to complement the AfDB-financed baseline project “Sustainable Capture Fisheries, Aquaculture Development and Watershed Development Project”. However, the development of synergies is contingent on the baseline project’s progress and success; this poses a risk to the proposed project, which should be discussed further in chapter 5 (risks).

- It is appreciated that the project aims for a strong ownership by communities, by training beach village committees (BVCs) in watershed planning and management. However, the proposed measures for climate-smart and gender-sensitive management plans remain vague and need explanation. Further, the introduction of innovative, foreign technology (e.g. floating agriculture) requires research (*proof of concept*) to adapt, promote, and apply technologies locally. In addition, under outcome 3.3, it would be desirable if - besides bee keeping and orchards - participative research could identify further alternative livelihood activities. In general, Germany would recommend assessing how the project can contribute to generating sustainable income generating activities for communities both from the river sources and those living down-stream.
- In this context, Germany would also recommend expanding engagement beyond beach village committees to communities at the upper watershed. It is not enough to only work with the fishing communities. It is important to also follow through the inlets (rivers), as this is where many sources of environmental degradation lie.
- For the sustainable long-term success of the proposed intervention, involvement of/engagement with the private sector is important. It is advisable to identify interested private sector actors in advance; this is in particular valid for proposed measures in outcome 3.3. Especially engagement with the local fishing industry should be considered.
- In this context, Germany would also like to inquire how communities will be incentivised to conduct labour intensive watershed rehabilitation works, and how this will be financed beyond project completion. A section addressing follow up financing at project completion could be added to the project proposal.
- The project design builds on relevant project interventions in Malawi (e.g. the FISH and FiRM projects by USAID) and is in line with important national strategies (e.g. National Adaptation Plan of Action NAPA). It is advisable to seek synergies with the BMZ funded Aquaculture Value Chain for Higher Income and Food Security in Malawi (AVCP) Programme (implemented by GIZ), especially for outcome 3.3.1. Specifically, it is advisable to actively participate and contribute to the nationally recognized Aquaculture Round Table (AquaRT) multi-stakeholder platform in order to assure alignment and coordination of the project within the donor landscape.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Expand on how the project will deal with personnel changes – both within the government and implementing partners – as the project moves forward;

- Provide more detail on how the project proposes to build capacity at the government and individual level;
- Expand on activities to increase local awareness of climate change;
- Expand upon how AfDB will cross-reference the work outlined in this PIF with similar or related programs and projects that are being carried out by other implementers and / or funding, and how AfDB will adjust this project to make sure that it is complimentary and not duplicative of ongoing activities; and,
- Expand on ways in which Ministries involved in this project will coordinate, including through planned institutional arrangements between Ministries.

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

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

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

6. Mali: Resilient, Productive and Sustainable Landscapes in Mali's Kayes Region; Agency: FAO; GEF Project Financing: \$2,271,406 (GEF ID 16 10362)

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal that aims to create climate resilient agro-sylvo-pastoral food systems and biodiversity by promoting innovations in governance, production and finance, with a strong focus on bottom-up approaches.

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

- Germany strongly urges FAO to clarify how it draws lessons from similar existing projects, especially climate adaptation efforts supported by UNDP and GIZ (funded by BMU) and small-scale irrigation projects funded by the Spanish cooperation in Kayes.
- Germany asks to clarify whether significant political and legal framework conditions were analyzed and whether the project's alignment with the national

land law (*Loi Foncière*) and associated action plan, as well as the National Small Irrigation Program (PNIP), was assessed. If not, Germany recommends including a section on the project's contributions to these action plans, as well as potential synergies.

- Germany suggests reviewing the project document as to identify whether remittances sent from Kayes' diaspora could be harnessed to contribute to project objectives.
- Germany asks to revise the stakeholder engagement section to identify capacities and weaknesses of partner organizations, incl. the National Directorate for Agriculture (DNA) and Food Security Commission (*Commissariat de Sécurité Alimentaire*). If significant risks are identified, the risk section should be updated accordingly.
- Germany further asks that the link between the NDC/NAP process and the project components, outcomes, and indicators is elaborated in more detail.
- Germany recommends submitting the project proposal for discussion to the donors' group in Mali (*Groupe Thématique Economie Agricole Rural*), coordinated by FAO and German development cooperation. In this context, Germany also suggests establishing cooperation with the Programme for the Support of the National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change in Mali commissioned by the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU).
- Germany welcomes that gender-sensitive approaches are explicitly considered in two out of the four project components. Germany would appreciate if the remaining two components would also include the aspect of gender equality.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Provide more detail on how the proposal plans to address any issues of limited capacity that arise, based on the complexity of the project.
- Consider the need to adjust the time frame of the project to fully achieve the outcomes described that encourage local ownership rather than direct delivery by the project itself.
- In reference to component 3 outputs, provide additional information on how to develop the skills and will to implement this project beyond the cooperative membership. Was this reorientation toward a circular economy sought by the cooperatives or the regional or sub-regional governments of Kayes?
- The proposed Delfino plowing technique requires a specially built, robust plow and typically requires a powerful all-wheel drive tractor, both of which are very expensive. Please clarify how to deal with these costs. Does the project intend to

provide these directly or find a sustainable approach to deliver these plowing services through private service delivery?

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

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

7. South Sudan: Watershed Approaches for Climate Resilience in Agro-Pastoral Landscapes; Agencies: UNDP and UNIDO; GEF Project Financing: \$8,471,461 (GEF ID 10178)

✓ **France Comments**

- In relation to water: it is a very interesting project given the targeted area. Political instability and conflict in Southern Sudan increase local populations' vulnerability to droughts. The project aims to improve food security by raising awareness and training in suitable agricultural and natural resource management practices to improve resilience to climate change. In addition, more than 50% of the estimated beneficiaries are women.
- In relation to food security: In view of the few lines of presentation, we have no real idea of how the project intends to respond to the major challenges of climate change resilience and food security.
- The **watershed approach** is interesting. In this respect, it will be necessary to use an integrated and multi-actor approach that associates decision-makers, advisers, farmers and livestock producers ...
- **Training** is an essential lever. However, the project does not specify who is concerned. The articulation between decision-makers and the field level is lacking in the description of the training of practitioners on the implementation of a set of strategies, policies and guidance documents.
- Finally, it is not clear in what sense and on what basis the improvement of natural resource management and restoration practices will take place.

❖ (Note that translation in English from French is by the GEF Secretariat)

✓ *Germany Comments*

Germany welcomes the proposal, which emphasises strengthening both climate resilience amongst agro-pastoral communities and female participation in natural resource management. Besides the strong gender focus, Germany appreciates the integration of the envisaged project with relevant national strategies and various development projects. The project has a clear rationale, a comprehensible theory of change, and potential for scalability. At the same time, Germany has the following comments it recommends addressing:

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

- Germany suggests clarifying with which specific CBOs cooperation is planned as part of the project's stakeholder engagement. CBO's are identified as key stakeholders to ensure community participation and representation of women, but only limited information is given on specific engagement activities.
- Given that co-financing of four Ministries is not yet secured, Germany asks to identify and detail what risks and mitigation options associated with possible omission of parts of the planned co-financing exist.
- Germany supports the high degree of attention the project puts on gender issues and female empowerment. However, the project proposal should explore in greater detail how active female representation will be ensured in e.g. watershed committees. In comparable cases, participatory approaches have solidified power imbalances within the communities because community leaders agreed on adaptation measures and benefit-sharing schemes that negatively affected poorer and less influential community members. This concern should be addressed.
- Germany welcomes the project's focus on low-cost and small-sized adaptation options described under the outputs 2.1., 2.2., and 2.4. However, the project proposal would benefit from a more detailed outline of how it will ensure that local communities will adopt the described techniques and continue to use them in the medium and long-term. Additionally, the project proposal may engage more thoroughly with local and traditional knowledge in this context.
- Germany appreciates the project proposal's emphasis on fostering local ownership through in-kind contributions (labor, materials, etc.) by the target population to the outputs described under 3.2.-3.4. However, the project proposal should explain maintenance needs of the respective structures, and how the local communities will be trained to conduct such activities independently in the long-term.
- Germany suggests that the implementing agencies incorporate lessons from the GIZ-project "Adapting agricultural production methods to climate change and stabilizing livelihoods in Western Bahr el Ghazal, South Sudan", which concluded in 2018. The project used field farmer schools to enable the local population to employ various adaptation measures, particularly in relation to

staple crops and vegetables. Additionally, the project strengthened the capacities of local government, by involving the agricultural extension services.

- Finally, Germany recommends a more thorough explanation of the social selection criteria.

8. Tanzania: Building Resilience through Sustainable Land Management and Climate Change Adaptation in Dodoma; Agency: AfDB; GEF Project Financing: \$3,759,000 (GEF ID 10418)

✓ **France Comments**

- Interesting project, in that it deals jointly with several causes of land degradation, in particular: urban sprawl, mining, deforestation and water contamination.
- It could be interesting in the context of the restoration of rural or peri-urban land, to promote agroecological approaches as a means to achieve improved and resilient land management, while creating new job opportunities and economic alternatives to mining. The civil society and Tanzanian authorities expressed their desire to integrate agroecological practices into policies as a result of the national conference on agroecology that was held in Dodoma in November 2019. The creation of a dedicated department within the Ministry of Agriculture has been discussed.

❖ (Note that translation in English from French is by the GEF Secretariat)

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the integrated and holistic approach of the project, given that many different sectors need to be involved in urban management plans in order to create climate-resilient and sustainable cities. Germany also welcomes that the project aims to integrate women and vulnerable groups into decision-making bodies and to consider gender-sensitive approaches in the design and implementation of the project.

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

- Germany appreciates that the project will be based on an assessment of urban resilience challenges in the city using publicly available global datasets. Germany suggests to perform this analysis in even more detail, given that it is important to base the project on solid risk assessments and predictions data. In this framework, the climate risk profiles established under the AGRICA project (commissioned by the BMZ and conducted by GIZ and Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK)) could be used as a valuable resource. The Tanzania risk profile is currently under construction and will be published soon.

Germany recommends measuring the projects contribution to the NDC/NAP process in more detail. An assessment of how project components, outcomes and indicators relate to the different processes would be helpful.

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Provide more information on how beneficiaries, including women, have been involved in the development of the project proposal and will benefit from this project;
- Consider the political risk of the government's long-term commitment to Dodoma as the functional capital of Tanzania, as the population growth may in fact not live up to projections in here.
- Expand on how this project is in line with national priorities including NAPAs and NAPS;

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

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

9. Vanuatu: Adaptation to Climate Change in the Coastal Zone in Vanuatu – Phase II (VCAP II); Agency: UNDP; GEF Project Financing: \$6,720,020 (GEF ID: 10415)

✓ **Germany Comments**

Germany welcomes the proposal that aims to deliver integrated approaches to community adaptation and the management of landscapes and protected marine areas building on the lessons learned from the first phase of the project.

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

- Germany would welcome the inclusion of dedicated activities to ensure gender safeguarding. While Germany welcomes that the project foresees a strong participatory process and emphasises on traditional knowledge and community-based approaches, the gender dimension is insufficiently mainstreamed.
- Germany kindly asks the agency to review the theory of change to clarify what

activities are linked to what project objectives, and why proposed technologies were used. The theory of change should then also more clearly be linked to specific indicators and the monitoring framework.

- Germany also suggests assessing whether activities that address illegal fisheries could be included.
- Germany kindly asks the agency to review the amount of co-finance mobilized. While the large volume of co-financing is appreciated, the alignment of some sources (e.g. EDF-11 fund) with stated project objectives is doubtful.
- To increase long-term sustainability, Germany recommends including a particular focus on upscaling throughout the Pacific region in Component 3 and 4, for example by using regional coordination processes to inform regional policy processes and frameworks.
- Finally, Germany encourages considering potential regional synergies with former and ongoing project activities, such as GIZ's projects on "Sustainable Management of Human Mobility within the Context of Climate Change" (highly relevant related to coping and relocation strategies of rural communities mentioned in the proposal), "Coping with Climate Change in the Pacific Island Region" and "Marine and Coastal Biodiversity Management in Pacific Island Countries".

✓ **United States Comments**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the PIF:

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

- Expand on how this project will address any issues that arise related to the human resources needed to localize the proposed projects such as development of local adaptation plans, climate proofing of infrastructure, development of an efficient early warning system, awareness raising and capacity building, and coastal re-vegetation and rehabilitation. These are all great goals but may present implementation challenges.
- Expand on how the project will deal with any personnel changes – both within the Vanuatu government and implementing partners – as the project moves forward.
- Provide more detail on how the success of the trainings outlined in this project will be measured and not duplicative of workshops and trainings already offered in the regions.
- Provide more detail on what was accomplished under the first version of this project, including what changes Vanuatu is experiences as a result of that project. Also expound on how this project is building on those successes.

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

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