



GREEN
CLIMATE
FUND

10 September 2021

Response matrix for Agriculture and Food Security Sector Guide

Summary

The accompanying sector guide was released for consultation in November 2020 and the consultation was open until the end of January 2021 to provide sufficient time for stakeholder to provide inputs. Consultation was open to the Board, advisers, observers, NDAs, Direct and International Access Entities, civil society, private sector representatives, partner institutions and sector experts. The Secretariat received more than 660 specific comments and feedback on this draft. These and the responses by the Secretariat sector experts on how these comments were considered in the updated version of the sector guide is contained in this document.

This feedback and response matrix has been prepared for information purposes only to share the different comments received by the organizations that submitted feedback to the GCF in response to the public consultation of the "Agriculture and Food security" draft for consultation version 2020.

The information and content in this document do not imply any judgment on the part of GCF concerning the legal status of any territory or any endorsement or acceptance of such boundaries.

Responses to feedback noted here are those of sector experts and may not necessarily be those of the GCF.

The mention of specific entities, including companies, does not necessarily imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by GCF.

For further inquiries regarding this feedback and response matrix please contact us via:

sectoralguides@gcfund.org

Sectoral Guide Section	Feedback (verbatim)	Organization	Response from GCF/DMA sectoral specialists
General	<p>Although in draft format (dra), the disclosure allows to have access to the Fund's broad lines of thought on the topic of agriculture, and potential fronts of investment. The contextualization of the sector, and the interface between agriculture and climate change, is presented in a quite balanced, and aligned with the understanding and positions defended by Brazil, in which the great priority is to strengthen the resilience of production systems, and migration actions, with control of emissions is also important, when and where possible (where possible and appropriate). The document leaves clear its priority for smaller scale food production systems, due to its vulnerability, in the However, it clearly presents the need for transversal and complementary action with all production scales. (these can build resilience for agriculture and improve livelihoods for both the most vulnerable and food insecure farmers, as well as more well-off market-oriented farmers). The document also recognizes that, in general, there is an interest in the sector for sustainability, and that actions that contradict this, in reality they are contrary to the sectorial interest, and punctual (Agri-food businesses gain from supporting sustainability through capturing market share, potenal price premiums, reducing reputaon risk, improved boom-line profits and ensuring long-term supply chain sustainability. Corporate social responsibility and greater investor support can also ensue). We hope that this balanced vision will be sent after receiving the comments that will be forwarded to the GCF.</p>	<p>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document</p>
General	<p>I highlight the internal opportunity for the Map to analyze the GCF proposal for the lines of action (1. promoting resilient agriculture; 2 Facilitating Informed Assistance and services risk management, and 3. reconfiguring the Food System), as well as the principles that guide Fund's investments. Understanding how the fund works, and the expected principles and scenarios, can allow guidance to develop rather compelling proposals that may not only strengthen actions on national territory to strengthen Brazilian agriculture, but also to contribute to the image of the Brazilian agricultural sector, as a reference and support for other developing countries develop their strategies. Additionally, the proposals are very transversal, and have alignment with several priorities established by the Map in its current management. As such, we reinforce our interest in information about the development of this document, and of the attachments to be added during 2021, as well as any webminars that have been added mentioned in the documents that sent the analyzed document. The CMCA remains available for clarification, as well as for further discussion, if seen as dress like timely by the Map. "[...].</p>	<p>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document</p>
General	<p>There is a longer section on insurance. This fails to reflect that many market insurance approaches are not adapted to the needs of the poorest people and are not affordable to them or do not come with enough work to build financial literacy e.g. The GCF should ensure, when supporting insurance approaches, to give clear attention to pro-poor approaches. The InsuResilience Global PArtnership Pro poor principles should be used as a reference. https://www.insuresilience.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/insuresilience_propoor_190529-2.pdf</p>	<p>CARE International</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>
General	<p>· Long-term capital - There are references to the need for long-term capital ("This gap will need to be filled by a 5:4:1 ratio of long-term agri-finance, short-term agri-finance, and non-agri finance") but this could be further emphasized. Most agri lending now is short-term working capital, i.e. loans for <12 months, while food systems change will require longer term loans and/or equity.</p>	<p>Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>
General	<p>· Working with existing agri funds/lenders - In addition to supporting new efforts and funds, suggestion to also try working with existing agri funds and lenders to discuss ways to include a climate change lens in their portfolio strategy. This could help shift the focus from the total amount of capital mobilized to the impact of the additional capital mobilized.</p>	<p>Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>

General	<p>· Microfinance - While mentioned ("Microfinance, especially when bundled with other services such as climate information, agro-advisories, and insurance, can be a successful business opportunity that promotes finance of low-emissions, climate-resilient agricultural production innovations at scale") I feel like microfinance as a sector to engage could be elevated. One example is the InsuResilience Investment Fund (debt sub-fund) which makes loans to microfinance institutions (MFIs) that bundle loans with insurance.</p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
General	<p>· Incentives - Incentives are mentioned ("Creating a paradigm shift – particularly for small-scale agricultural producers – involves incentives and opportunities for shifting from subsistence, climate-impacted livelihoods to more climate-resilient and food secure livelihoods, with greater market integration and climate-resilient value chains") but could be further highlighted. We have seen an evolution in the market from guarantees, to blended finance vehicles, to incentives. These approaches are not mutually exclusive and can all work together. One example is Aceli Africa. In addition to providing incentives to lenders to reduce risk and increase profitability of agri-SME loans, Aceli also encourages its partners to make "climate smart" loans (see page 39 here). - https://bit.ly/2LfjGld</p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is welcome. Incentive based mechanisms are a key part of GCF projects. A short paragraph has been included in pathway 3: reconfiguring food systems page 18.
General	<p>· Transparency - Any project that is funded with public money should be held to a high level of transparency. This should include description of activities, portfolio, and results. Not only would their work be creating positive externalities, their experience should also be considered a public good to help others learn from, replicate, and improve rather than confidential proprietary information.</p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Fully agree. Transparency is part of all projects and the monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management of project seeks to help build on the experience and ideas brought by the project. Transparency is well embedded across the guide and project formulation following the guide.
General	<p>· Background - Including a little history/background would be helpful for someone like me who was not familiar with GCF.</p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The comment is appreciated. The summary section as well as a two page overview of the sector guide have been developed to briefly introduce GCF's role and mandate.
General	<p>· <u>Acumen - Different names are used for the fund which can be confusing. e.g. ACUMEN equity fund for African agriculture, Acumen Resilient Agriculture Fund (ARAF), and Acumen Fund for Climate Resilience. This fund also doesn't seem to be mentioned on Acumen's website.</u></p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is welcome. The references to ACUMEN refer to the Acument Resilient Agriculture Fund, and this has now been corrected.
General	<p>· Ecosystem service payment-for-performance contracts - This is the only item in the following list I wasn't familiar with and wondered if including a description would be helpful: "Additional keys to success in blended financing include: layered capital structures for both public and private sources; leveraging financial instruments that are not yet widely used in the sector, including profit participating debt, structured debt, ecosystem service payment-for-performance contracts, equity subscriptions, warrants, and convertible debt; avoiding prescriptiveness; considering additional revenue streams, such as project establishment support and carbon finance; conducting pre-investment planning, including coordinating across ministries and creating mechanisms to receive and deploy climate finance; bringing in international and domestic DFIs, and ensuring that every project truly leverages additional capital."</p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Agree. A small amendment has been made. The reference now reads payment for ecosystem services
General	<p>Carbon credits - Would be interested to hear whether they think carbon credits could play a substantial role, or not, in future solutions ("In combination, these two crucial roles pave the way to blended financing. For example, policies and regulations can enact mandatory reporting, carbon credit and social responsibility requirements, mainstreaming of climate into national budgets, and climate-related financial risk disclosures.") While the compliance market has collapsed, the corporate voluntary market seems to still be a viable option to consider, e.g. The Livelihoods Carbon Funds.</p>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated. Carbon credits have not been addressed in this version of the sector guide as it is outside the scope of the guide and sector approach. The discussion on carbon credits is more related to the forest and land use and ecosystems sectoral guides

General	· Africa warehouse receipt program - Why isn't the name mentioned for this IFC supported project?	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feed is appreciated. The name of the program is mentioned in the project examples.
General	Thank you for informative guidelines, which depict very well the current challenges in the sector. A large part of the information provided in this guide is generic information about GCF and not specific for the agricultural sector, including in Figure 1. This information should be the same in all sectoral guidance papers – perhaps in a “chapeau paper”? Sectoral guidance paper should then be as concise as possible.	GCF BM Advisor	Thank you. The guide follows the same outline as all other sectoral guides and aims to help position the individual sector and outline the key challenges and opportunities and then identify key GCF priorities.
General	... This guide is rather laborious to read. National Designated Authorities and other sectoral stakeholders would benefit from more pragmatic step by step-guidance. Even though there will be “how to tools”, it would be useful to shorten and improve readability of this document. For example, there are long lists on resilient agricultural technologies repeated several places - these could be collected in one table. Tables could also be used when presenting many numbers in one paragraph. ...	GCF BM Advisor	Thank you. The objectives of this guide and all other sectors is to help outline the challenges and opportunities across sectors and identify GCF's role. The intention is to conduct future training and develop additional material that will be targeted e.g. NDAs and other stakeholders.
General	Agriculture adaptation is the priority of developing countries and the focus of GCF support. Therefore, we suggest sector guide to focus on adaptation target and illustrate mitigation target in a balance way, in order to avoid enlarging financing gap betw	GCF BM Advisor	Agree. The guide focuses on three paradigm shifting pathways linking adaptation and mitigation. The third pathway, reconfiguring food systems embeds the first two pathways and focuses equally on mitigation and reducing emissions from food production, and from food loss and waste.
General	...such as e.g. biodiversity and ocean preservation. ...	GCF BM Advisor	Thank you for the feedback. Biodiversity if fully integrated in the guide, in particular in the first pathway on promoting resilient agroecology. Ocean preservation is dealt with by another sectoral guide, on ecosystems and ecosystem services.
General	... What we are missing in the sectoral guidance paper is an analysis of the existing international financing architecture and expertise and how GCF would fit in there – how would GCF be complementary to other organizations like IFAD and WB? Which financing gaps would GCF address? ...	GCF BM Advisor	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
General	... One of the paradigm shift mentioned is about food systems transformation. What we miss in this context is the link between climate resilient agriculture and production and what the food systems summit 2021 calls “shifting to sustainable consumption”.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. The third pathway on food systems focuses on the entire food system processes at various levels and will further build on the summit outcomes to also include sustainable consumption. Later iterations of the guide will include and update this.

General	Generally speaking, the document is very elaborate in terms of what can be done. However, it is relatively thin in terms of what should be done or prioritized, thus, in terms of actual guidance. This guidance could therefore be further strengthened and worked out more clearly. Figure Es.1 and Box 1 are, for instance, useful in terms of providing more guidance. More guidance could e.g. be given by providing them with a more central space in the document and better connecting the pathways and drivers (Section 3) and Investment Criteria (Section 5) sections.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Thank you for the feedback. The guide follows an outline used by all sectors aiming to provide an overall situation analysis of the sector and GCF's role to promote paradigm shift. The specific priorities within each paradigm shifting pathway will be further proposed and developed in the funding proposals following the guide and proposing the most innovative ideas within each pathway linked to their specific context.
General	As a title, "Agriculture, food systems and food security" would better reflect the content of the Sector Guide	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Thank you for the comment. All titles of the sectoral guides, follow the precise title of the individual result areas targeted by the GCF, the title chosen is therefore agriculture and food security.
General	1. The expression "changing climate" throughout the two documents, must be change each time by "climate change".	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Thank you for the comment, however we disagree. The guide makes use of both expressions climate change and changing climate to support the narrative and scope of the document.
General	2. The first "paradigm-shifting" mentions "promoting resilient agriculture", we prefer the formulation "sustainable and resilient agriculture". Some agricultural practices can be resilient while being unsustainable (e.g. GMOs or certain pesticides/fertilisers). Mentioning sustainability also makes it possible to take into account the preservation and sustainable management of biodiversity and natural resources. ...	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Thank you for the comment. The first pathway has been changed to ' promoting resilient agroecology' to also secure a broader integration of sustainable management of biodiversity and natural resources and avoiding GMOs and certain pesticides or fertilizers.
General	... Finally, the use of the term "sustainable" makes it possible to take into account not only environmental aspects but also economic aspects (fair price for producers) and social aspects (decent jobs).	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Sustainability is embedded across the guide and within each pathway included the first on resilient agroecology.
General	3. This sectoral guide offers some examples of climate resilient practices and mentions (p.16) the "drought-tolerant maize": it should be ensured that this does not include GM seeds, as France does not finance the purchase, promotion and multiplication of GM seeds	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is well received. The projects referred to as examples and the overall promotion of resilient varieties will not include GM seeds. To avoid confusion the sentence including drought tolerant maize has been deleted
General	4. The sectoral guide also mentions (p.16) the "drought-tolerant and high in iron bean", the French position on fortified food products is: "Fortified food products can be viewed as extra support in specific contexts and for specific targets, but the main food approach to fighting malnutrition must be based on promoting healthy, diversified and sustainable diets", the Green Fund should be asked to clarify the understanding of these two examples.	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The comment is well noted. The sentence refers to a case by case basis and to avoid confusion, the sentence will be deleted.

General	5. The sectoral guide does not mention agro-ecology, which should be explicitly added to the list of sustainable agricultural practices on page 17. As a proposal: "These include (but are not limited to) improving management of paddy rice, grazing land, livestock, manure, nitrogen; enhancing soil health and organic carbon sequestration in cropping systems; tailoring improved seed and crops to local contexts; and increasing agroforestry, agroecology and regenerative agriculture".	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The comment is well received and the suggested update has been made accordingly in the pathway 1 description and the pathway 1 title has been updated and now reads "promoting resilient agroecology"
General	6. In the third "paradigm-shifting", it is also important to take sustainability into account, so we would prefer to reword the title as "reconfiguring sustainable food systems".	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated however the proposed third option of food systems has sustainability embedded in all aspects with sustainability being part of every step and sub system within the proposed food systems approach.
General	7. With regard to the health/healthy diet aspects in food systems, we have made comments in the document. Nutrition is overall scarcely mentioned in the document, we added it in some places. As a reminder, in 2019, chronic malnutrition affected 21.3% (144 million) of children under 5 years old and 5.6% (38.3 million) of children under 5 years old were overweight. Malnutrition in children compromises their physical and cognitive development. This malnutrition is well linked to unhealthy food systems.	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
General	8. The importance of education and training of farmers, agricultural advisers and producer organisations (including the inclusion of agro-ecology in training courses) is also an important axis to enable the emergence of sustainable food systems that should be included.	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Agree. Capacity building, training and access to extension services is important and is embedded in all three pathways.
General	9. Knowing that 3 pathways are presented, visibly parallel to each other, it seems completely inappropriate to focus on the second one, for example, without having done everything possible to reach the first one (resilient agriculture).	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Agree. The three pathways go hand in hand and should ideally be promoted in parallel within one proposed project or combining different projects and funds to achieve the three pathways in parallel. A short paragraph has been added to highlight the connectivity between the three pathways.
General	We appreciate the thorough investigation undertaken to develop the guidelines and make them consistent with the investment criteria.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated
General	As the document signals, needs are far beyond currently planned to address climate change on part 2 countries. As well, complexities arise in determining subsector priorities, scale, paradigm shift potential and geographical distribution.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated. Each pathway will need to be further broken down and detailed interventions identified in the project formulation phase to identify the most suitable solutions within a given context .
General	After a careful analysis, we believe the document can improve a few critical components: 1. Any approach taken or guideline applied must be able to be measured in terms of its contribution to emission reductions, whether by project or sector as a whole, allowing a better spending focalization or resource redistribution.	GCF Alternative BM	Agree. The guide focuses on the overall situation of the sector and GCF's role. The individual projects formulated based on the guide will provide details on emission reductions where applicable.

General	2. The guideline should recognize that “plain vanilla” projects can be a good way to move forward in the coming years.	GCF Alternative BM	Thank you for the comment. The guide looks beyond the individual project but wishes to inspire and promote the most innovative interventions through the three pathways to help strengthen the pipeline.
General	3. The document can be improved in terms of forestry contributions and relevance to address climate change. In particular, existing the simplicity and availability of instruments as REDD+.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. REDD+ is addressed in the forest and land use sector guidance and will not be addressed in the agriculture and food security guide.
General	4. In terms of climate risks, Latin-American countries are amongst the most vulnerable ones that seems to be lost or not clearly reflected at the regional analysis.	GCF Alternative BM	Feedback is welcome. The regional analysis provides an overall view of the current vulnerability. Specific contexts for countries and sub regions will developed at the project level.
General	5. International trade on agricultural and forestry products, play a key role to sustaining small farming, jobs and innovation, therefore and effort to avoid any new tariff measures or implementing trade distortive subsidies.	GCF Alternative BM	Agree. The third pathway on food systems seeks to address and ensure a smooth and sustainable trade for given products.
General	6. These guidelines shall not be interpreted as a check list of qualities on every project, but a general reference.	GCF Alternative BM	Thank you for the feedback. the guidelines will only help set the scene and provide an overview of the possible paradigm shift in the agriculture sector but will not be a checklist.
General	1. Inconsistencies in presentation and contents between this Guide and the Cities Guide	GCF Secretariat	The feedback is appreciated. The sectoral guide uses the same template as the other guides e.g. forest and land use, ecosystems etc.
General	3. Unclear who is the audience. Agriculture specialists? Non-specialists considering climate-related projects in agriculture?	GCF Secretariat	The audience is countries, NDAs, AEs, partners and all other stakeholder groups.
General	4. Following on from point 3, unclear what is the purpose of the Guide.	GCF Secretariat	The purpose of the guide and that of the other guides is to present the direction across sectors on how GCF sees the opportunity to achieve paradigm shift and where the likelihood of achieving the biggest impact lies.

General	<p>However, we noticed that the draft sector guides lack information about sector-specific environmental and social risks and mitigation strategies to minimize risks. For example, projects or programmes to develop climate-friendly cities, buildings and urban systems may have their own environmental and social consequences, such as fragmentation of wildlife habitat, introduction of invasive species, extreme urbanization, involuntary resettlement, and air pollution, etc. Similarly, projects/programmes in the agriculture and food security sector may also produce adverse impacts, such as loss of biodiversity, water contamination, child labour, involuntary resettlement, indigenous people's rights and customs and territorial claims, etc. We believe that anyone interested in receiving funding from the GCF to implement projects/programmes should be aware of the potential environmental and social safeguards (ESS) and risks relevant to the sector in order to develop a well-planned funding proposal acceptable to the GCF.</p>	GCF Secretariat	<p>Thank you for the feedback. The sectoral guide seeks to present the overall direction of where paradigm shift can be best achieved and where GCF can support a larger and longer term impact. The specific ESS related issues will be developed and assessed at the project/programme level.</p>
General	<p>From our review of similar documents published by other international financial institutions, we found that many of them cover ESS risks. For instance, IFC's Utility-Scale Solar Photovoltaic Power Plants: A Project Developer's Guide is very technical but discusses the basics of ESS and the potential risks relevant to this sector, such as biodiversity, land acquisition, cultural heritage, indigenous peoples, etc. Also, World Bank's GOOD PRACTICE HANDBOOK - Environmental Flows for Hydropower Projects: Guidance for the Private Sector in Emerging Markets gives examples of potential risks such as the projects' impact on tourism and communities' spiritual use, etc. We believe that GCF sector guides should also provide examples of relevant social and environmental risks and the ways to mitigate those risks.</p>	GCF Secretariat	<p>Thank you for the feedback. Please see reply above.</p>
General	<p>An alternative to including such risks in the sector guide itself may be the production of a companion guidebook that addressed ESS and related risks and mitigatory and avoidance measures. We have found examples of such companion guidebooks published by the IFC and EBRD. IFC has published the Environmental and Social Management System (ESMS) Implementation Handbook on a few different sectors such as construction, animal production, crop production, etc. The EBRD has also produced Sub-sectoral Environmental and Social Guidelines on different topics such as construction, timber and wood products, transport, etc. Such guidebooks would allow the project implementers to identify major risks, develop management actions and consider the vast scope of potential risks that may stem from implementing GCF funded activities in specific sectors.</p>	GCF Secretariat	<p>Thank you for the feedback. Please see reply above.</p>
General	<p>In our view, having ESS and risks addressed in a single guide is much more convenient and effective from a project developers point of view and urge you to consider including such a section in the two grant guides as well as in future drafts of other GCF sector guides. We are concerned that not doing so, may, in the long term, potentially increase the complaints that the IRM may receive from project affected people.</p>	GCF Secretariat	<p>Thank you for the feedback. Please see reply above.</p>
General	<p>The agriculture and food security sectoral guide makes a good analysis of the main impacts and climate risks in the agrifood sector, from agricultural to livestock practices and the processing industry, consumption, including the need to promote healthier diets and reduce waste, which is key to minimizing emissions from this sector. As with the other sectors, but perhaps even more in this one, there are no global solutions to address best practices and technologies at the local level, the context of each country and each region/exploitation has to be analyzed, both for mitigation and adaptation.</p>	GCF BM Advisor	<p>Thank you very much for the comment. This is well received. The guide wishes to start with the overall general picture and fully recognizes that solutions are context based and country specific.</p>
General	<p>Emissions from this sector come primarily from livestock (enteric fermentation and manure management) and the use of nitrogen fertilization for crops, but also rice fields (which in many developing countries are a very important crop), as well as emissions from deforestation (from changes in land use). And there would also be all the emissions from the energy sector linked to this sector (including transport).</p>	GCF BM Advisor	<p>Agree. The agroecology pathway and food systems pathway seek to address the issue of low emission agriculture and in the food systems including in directly transport, which however will be more developed in the transport sector guide.</p>

General	Regarding climate impacts and risks, point 2) of the Paradigm Shift - "Facilitating climate informed and risk management services" - is fundamental. Support to climate services must be strengthened for the short, medium and long term. And, when planning this sector in the medium and long term, information from regionalized climate scenarios must be taken into account to guide decision-making. In addition, planning together with other sectors such as water resources, or coordination with health policies is key (regarding the promotion of healthier diets).	GCF BM Advisor	Agree. Climate information and risk management is key for planning and adapting. This aspect is fully embedded in the second pathway and also relates directly to the other two pathways.
General	The document mentions that agriculture is mainly supplied by rainwater, but many developing countries have been developing wells and irrigation, storage and canalization systems for a long time: small-scale irrigation and other forms of agricultural water management are critical in building resilience to increased climate variability. Adapting irrigation to climate change will be increasingly necessary: http://www.fao.org/in-action/aicca/overview/background/en/	GCF BM Advisor	Thank you for the comment. The focus is on the most vulnerable rainfed farming systems but irrigation and water management is indeed also prioritized across the pathways and in connection with the water sectoral guide.
General	Finally, we saw no mention in the document regarding how climate change will affect foreign food trade, which is highly globalized and will undergo major changes in demand if environmental and sustainability criteria are integrated.	GCF BM Advisor	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document.
General	The concept "food systems" is extensively used in the document but it is not defined. It is important that the term is defined as this will ensure a common understanding on what it means. It will also be important to explain the relationship between food systems and food security.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is welcome. A definition is now included in the introduction in footnote 2 from FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO. 2020. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2020. Transforming food systems for affordable healthy diets. Rome, FAO. https://doi.org/10.4060/ca9692en
General	WWF recommends including a stronger incorporation of food loss and waste (FLW) within the GCF's Draft Sector Guide on Agriculture and Food Security. There is a direct connection between avoiding land conversion and the imperative to reduce food loss and waste in order to maximize the use of available food from a finite agricultural footprint. In particular, Pathway 3: Reconfiguring food systems should include the importance of measurement, data and transparency. Data transparency and actively measuring and monitoring food waste across the supply chain in near-real time, would present points of intervention to address FLW. Without measurement, it becomes more difficult to address the issue.	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Thank you. FLW is embedded in the third pathway on food systems as one of the key interventions listed. Further details on specific measurements and data, will be handled at the individual project/programme level once submitted.
General	Furthermore, food system "reconfiguration" would be better characterized as a food system "redesign", as better design equates to reduction of loss and waste. FLW is a product of poor design.	World Wildlife Fund (WWF)	Disagree. Reconfiguring food systems is embedding redesign and focuses strongly on food loss and waste.
General	The agriculture and food security sectoral guide makes a good analysis of the main impacts and climate risks in the agrifood sector, from agricultural to livestock practices and the processing industry, consumption, including the need to promote healthier diets and reduce waste, which is key to minimizing emissions from this sector. As with the other sectors, but perhaps even more in this one, there are no global solutions to address best practices and technologies at the local level, the context of each country and each region/exploitation has to be analyzed, both for mitigation and adaptation. Emissions from this sector come primarily from livestock (enteric fermentation and manure management) and the use of nitrogen fertilization for crops, but also rice fields (which in many developing countries are a very important crop), as well as emissions from deforestation (from changes in land use). And there would also be all the emissions from the energy sector linked to this sector (including transport).	Advisor to BM Marta Mulas	Agree. Feedback is appreciated. The synergies with other sectors e.g. forest and land use and energy are indeed crucial. The specific local context is important and will be addressed at the project level once submitted.

General	Regarding climate impacts and risks, point 2) of the Paradigm Shift - "Facilitating climate informed and risk management services" - is fundamental. Support to climate services must be strengthened for the short, medium and long term. And, when planning this sector in the medium and long term, information from regionalized climate scenarios must be taken into account to guide decision-making. In addition, planning together with other sectors such as water resources, or coordination with health policies is key (regarding the promotion of healthier diets).	Advisor to BM Marta Mulas	Agree. The second pathway addresses this and seeks to provide long term transformation and synergies with other sectors are crucial. This is well embedded across all three pathways.
General	The document mentions that agriculture is mainly supplied by rainwater, but many developing countries have been developing wells and irrigation, storage and canalization systems for a long time: small-scale irrigation and other forms of agricultural water management are critical in building resilience to increased climate variability. Adapting irrigation to climate change will be increasingly necessary: http://www.fao.org/in-action/aicca/overview/background/en/	Advisor to BM Marta Mulas	Agree. Please see response above under point 51.
General	Finally, we saw no mention in the document regarding how climate change will affect foreign food trade, which is highly globalized and will undergo major changes in demand if environmental and sustainability criteria are integrated.	Advisor to BM Marta Mulas	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document.
General	The Sectoral Guides on Agriculture and Food Security and Cities, Building and Urban Systems are structured similarly and therefore, have the same strengths and weaknesses. They go straight to the point of prescribing areas for focus, primarily: a choice among the enumerated paradigm shifting pathways and the identification of indicative residual barriers in achieving the climate objectives for the above two general thematic areas. Presumably, these are also the recommended focus of the country proposals for GCF funding. However, there is a critical step or component missing in the Guides to provide developing countries with a systematic process of analyzing their own specific climate related problems and remaining hurdles. The Philippines views the prescriptions on climate responses, whether on greenhouse gas mitigation or adaptation reflected in the current iteration of the Sectoral Guides as incomplete. It is, therefore, recommended to include in the Guides a reference to and discussion on the assessment of country specific climate-related issues that proponents want addressed. If the guides are prescriptive on the paradigm shifting points/areas, it could be prescriptive in the use of specific tools and approaches in problem analysis to come up with country responsive proposals. For example, if a country proponent wants to focus on mitigation, the main source of the actions to be applied support for would come from the country's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC). If it is primarily on Adaptation, the proponent has to be guided on the need to use a particular analytical methodology and tools to identify systematically its adaptation related problems and potential fit for purpose intervention(s). As Adaptation seeks to be primarily anticipatory, not reactive, a risk management approach and methodology should be prescribed for the perfunctory analytics. In sum, the Guides must be able to provide guidance in the design of the proposals in whatever sectoral concern eligible for GCF funding, in addition and incremental to those provided by the relevant GCF policy instruments on key result areas and investment criteria, among others. There is a need to align the needs of countries and the more prescriptive approach of GCF on particular focus areas through a pre-requisite analytics using assessment methodologies recognized globally as standard such as quantitative risk assessments	Alternate BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
General	The issues and the direction on strategic investments in ANR sector required to comply with the Paris Agreement are particularly well explained in Executive Summary and Chapter 1.	Asian Development Bank	The feedback is appreciated.
General	Readers would benefit more if the document can improve the elaboration of climate information services (how specific information system feed into agriculture and adaptation actions of which parties, how instrumental such information in changing the investment behaviors of farmers, rural population and companies, who provides and ensures the information quality, how these system is financed and maintained etc.)	Asian Development Bank	Thank you. Climate information services are a key part of the second pathway and linked to other two pathways. Further details on CIS can also be found in the "climate information and early warning systems sectoral guide"

General	<p>We have significant concerns as this document contains many biases and assumptions that are not in line with human rights, the SDGs, and best practice. The process of delineating comments at this level may not be best suited for this document when the serious concerns about orientation and directions from civil society and Indigenous Peoples could have been addressed much earlier in the document's conception.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document.</p>
General	<p>We generally appreciate the structure and flow of the draft guide, and this model seems appropriate for structuring other guides.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated and will be shared with other sectors</p>
General	<p>Reorient to center human rights, local food security, and food sovereignty. There is no mention or recognition of 'food sovereignty' which is integral to food security and the social safety net for the farming community. Food sovereignty and security reinforce resilience in agriculture. The Secretariat says that it only acts according to Board guidance, hence the use of food security, instead of sovereignty, and they claim that the term does not in anyway limit the meaning of the scope of the guidance. We respectfully disagree. Food sovereignty is more comprehensive and inclusive and starts from a human rights perspective, which is absent in the entire document. Human rights and food sovereignty should be central to this guidance. Further, the guidance should be in line with the envisaged goal of the UN Food Systems Summit to "Ensure access to safe and nutritious food for all." This requires a more systemic approach that is wider than looking at productivity and profits, to also address key impeding factors including underlying economic and often also cultural marginalisation. This also neglects the role of small-scale farmers as producers of food for their own survival and livelihoods (see Overarching Comment #2). Through this inappropriate choice to frame the document as addressing global food security rather than local food security and food sovereignty, the document embeds a bias toward globalization and market-based "solutions" that do not actually build climate resilience for the communities the GCF should be serving. The guidance should stress the importance of cross-cutting projects and encourage fewer top-down approaches in favor of rights-based community-owned approaches developed bottom-up.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document.</p>

General	<p><u>Value the role of small-scale producers. Despite the recognition that these smallholders produce much of the planet's food, the role of small-scale producers is undervalued by presuming they need top-down solutions, ones that also valorize a global in scope, market-based approach to food production. There is a lack of recognition that a large number of farmers are practicing climate resilient, agroecological approaches and are thought leaders in their communities. GCF finance must go to scaling up those approaches and creating opportunity for horizontal knowledge sharing rather than top-down dissemination. A focus on smallholder producers and vulnerable communities (and risk-proofing their production practices), should prioritize adaptation. Instead, this document focuses on commercial viability, integrating farmers into agri-business value chains, etc. without any reference to unequal power relations, or mechanisms to protect fundamental rights when they are faced with big data and digitalisation. Instead of recognizing the risks facing vulnerable groups and truly appreciating that smallholders provide most of the planet's food, which is under threat from not only climate change but corporate landgrabs and unsustainable practices, the document winds up proposing failed models with the use of ICT, digitalization, and increased use of unregulated financial instruments or insurance that purport to benefit smallholders but don't center their experiences and knowledge and value their provision of food security to their families and communities. In alignment with Overarching Comment #6, UNCFs recognizes the vulnerabilities especially for its CSM constituencies such as small holder producers, women, indigenous peoples, farm workers etc. and has centered its work around the human rights framework, and its Global Strategic Framework (GSF) which guides CFS work on food security in the context of climate change. See also the promotion of farmers' engagement in policymaking and planning processes, as captured in a KJWA submission by the Farmers' Constituency, https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/SubmissionsStaging/Documents/202004221810---200420%20KJWA%202e2f%20Farmers%20Constituency.pdf.</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated and is strongly embedded in the document. The paradigm shifting pathways are strongly based on the local and traditional knowledge in their scaling up and as part of their exit strategy.
General	<p><u>Integrate a cross-cutting gender analysis and recognize Indigenous Peoples. Efforts to build climate resilient food systems must put the promotion of gender equality at its core and recognize and value the experiences, knowledge, and needs of Indigenous Peoples. While we welcome that the inclusion of women, youth and marginalised communities is occasionally highlighted throughout the document, we reject the framing that their productivity and profits and their portrayal as "workforce" is put at the centre. No mention about how the guidance intends to support and recognize traditional knowledge and contributions of indigenous peoples to agriculture and food sovereignty. There is also scant acknowledgement of the predominant role of women smallholder farmers in food production. Please see the Women and Gender Constituency's submission on the Koronivia Joint Work Programme on Agriculture, https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/SubmissionsStaging/Documents/202006102100---WomenGenderConstituency-Koronivia-Submission-SB52.pdf.</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document.
General	<p><u>Promote agroecology. This document fails to promote one of the key agricultural solutions that is evidence-based and necessary for climate resilience. The evidence for agroecology and diversified agroecological systems being more resilient is plentiful. e.g. see this recent report published by FAO - http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb0438en The FAO High Level Panel of Experts report on agroecology is also important - http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe/en/ The agroecology framing also places emphasis on the co-creation of knowledge, where the knowledge of farmers and local communities are central, which the GCF guide and drivers of paradigm shift (coalitions and knowledge to scale up success) do not seem to place any priority on. Shifting the paradigm toward agroecology would mean a focus on regionalized food systems and micro enterprises (which are left out of the discussion largely), not value chains that absorb these farmers, and impoverish them. Farmers have developed many technologies and practices that are adaptation - see this publication: Clements, R., J. Hagggar, A. Quezada, and J. Torres (2011). Technologies for Climate Change Adaptation – Agriculture Sector. X. Zhu (Ed.). UNEP Ris. Centre, Roskilde, 2011 - https://tech-action.unepdtu.org/publications/technologies-for-climate-change-adaptation-agriculture-sector/</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The comment is well received. An update on agroecology has been added in line with comment 28 above and the first pathway has been changed to be promoting resilient agroecology.

<p>General</p>	<p>Stop focusing on the private sector, market approaches, and the promotion of corporate interests as goals. This document suffers from a deep conflation of means and ends, where the assumption that the private sector is the best means to the end of climate resilient agriculture and reduced emissions (which it is not) is perverted into the direct promotion of market integration for small farmers as the end itself. Transformative changes in agriculture require investment support to in-situ farming rather than to agribusiness supply chains to bring in real reductions in GHG emissions. The guidance has a strong focus on maximizing public finance by leveraging private investments and while the amount of finance needed is admittedly considerable and public sources are not enough and should be deployed strategically, it should be considered whether these options could actually reach the poorest and most vulnerable producers, especially when investing in adaptation. These producers are not only the most vulnerable but, by the document's own account, represent a majority of farmers in the world. The text also seems to rely on various platforms and networks that are pushing the corporate interests (fertilizers, climate smart agriculture, etc.). This is a concern. Corporate agribusiness and industrial agriculture enjoy huge financial investment through perverse subsidies that drive deforestation and biodiversity loss. The GCF guidelines should ensure that such financial investments that facilitate perverse incentives are discouraged in agricultural and livestock investment. Subsidies in the form of financial support, especially public finance, should be directed towards providing remunerative prices to farm produce to protect farmers and their livelihoods from the vagaries of climate change and encourage them to continue with farming. Therefore, scarce public finance should be well directed and not used to leverage private finance in agriculture. Correspondingly, there is no differentiation in the document between the role of industrial agriculture in causing climate change and also in being less resilient to climate change vs. smallholder agroecological farming which is resilient and can both contribute to adaptation and mitigation (e.g. through avoided emissions). Not making this differentiation risks channeling funding to false solutions, e.g. technological approaches such as GM or 'sustainable intensification' instead of going to real solutions such as agroecology and organic agriculture. Public Private Partnerships (PPP) in agriculture and farming should be discouraged in a situation where the farmers form the bottom most ladder in the global supply chain and will lead to exploitation being subjected to the market variations and volatility.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated . Private sector is in this guide not linked only to large scale corporations but rather focusing on micro to small scale level.</p>
<p>General</p>	<p><u>Use appropriate context and references. This document is not informed by the multilateral policy documents on agriculture and food systems endorsed by world governments through the UN World Committee on Food Security (UN CFS). First and foremost this sectoral guide needs to be informed by the Global Strategic Framework (http://www.fao.org/cfs/home/products/onlineqsf/en), endorsed unanimously by the world governments at the UN CFS Plenary in October 2017. UN CFS recognizes the vulnerabilities especially for its CSM constituencies such as small holder producers, women, indigenous peoples, farm workers etc. and has centered its work around the human rights framework, and its Global Strategic Framework guides CFS work on food security in the context of climate change. This document must use the decade long evidence gathering (through HLPE) conducted by the UNCFs whose focus too is vulnerable communities in the food systems. Thus UNCFs functions as the most inclusive multilateral governance mechanism, and here smallholder food producers (through CFS's Civil society mechanism), and commercial farmers and agribusiness (through its Private sector mechanism) together with UN agencies and member states, through CFS policy convergence process, develop instruments to guide national governments meet food security challenges. Since its reform in 2009, CFS is keenly aware of climate risks, and incorporates the need for adaptation as central to meeting food security in a climate challenged environment. They recognize the need for transformations in the food system, so that its ecological footprint is reduced, while ensuring food security and nutrition. The other multilaterally agreed policy decisions that have GSF as a framework are available at http://www.fao.org/cfs/home/products/onlineqsf/4/en/ CFS secretariat is supported by the three RBAs (FAO, IFAD,WFP); and for the evidence used in support of those policy decisions see: http://www.fao.org/cfs/cfs-hlpe/hlpe-reports/en/ . The last two would be especially helpful: CFS-HLPE report on the global narrative on good systems http://www.fao.org/3/ca9731en/ca9731en.pdf (2020) and CFS-HLPE report on the Agroecological approaches (that not only help in adaptation but simultaneously also in mitigation) and other innovations for sustainable</u></p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated . the document is built on the basis on key scientific evidence and articles.</p>

General	<p>Use appropriate terminology. This document uses terminology both vaguely and indiscriminately to promote a worldview in line with private interests rather than UN guidance. Climate-smart: There is too much mention of climate smart seeds and agriculture but no clear definition about what these are. We know that the GCF does not like an “exclusion list” but the guidance should include an indication of what “climate smart” is not (i.e. no-go zones). Value-chain: Through the text the word value-chain/ value chain actor is used to refer to food systems and to anyone engaged in food and ag systems (an agricultural worker to an MNC-); It presupposes that everyone, including MSMEs is a cog in the wheel of value chain, and the whole food system is the same as value chain. Suggest replacing Value-Chain/ Value-chain actor with the term Food systems / Food system workers or food system actors, whichever is appropriate for the specific context through the text, except when the reference is to vertically integrated multi-step value chain operations. SMEs: Rather than referring to SMEs, micro enterprises and cooperatives should be added to all references to SMEs through out and replaced by MSMEs), as in most developing countries micro enterprises are the source of livelihood especially for women. Micro enterprises and food and agricultural marketing cooperatives help strengthen locally and regionally appropriate food systems, as well as thriving rural communities; A co-benefit is reducing livelihood-related migration out of rural communities. Additionally, using MSMEs is more consistent with professed priorities of the GCF’s PSF, PSAG recommendations, and own pilot program approaches (namely the one for MSMEs). Nature-Based Solutions: The one mention, on page 13, as noted in our detailed comments, should be removed as this term, like climate-smart, means many different things to many different people, and within the UN system, it has no meaning and it has not been formally defined by any UN official bodies or by the UNFCCC, convention to which the GCF serves.</p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated , but terminology used is fully aligned with other ongoing interventions, and aligned with scientific literature. Pathway one is now changed to agroecology and other suggested wording is included already.
General	<p>Connect with Other International Institutions: Similar to the failure noted in Overarching Comment #6 about taking into consideration existing context and references, this document also does not take into account or acknowledge the existing multiplicity of actors, institutions, and funding streams that play a role in current design, implementation, and financing for agriculture adaptation. The GCF should seek to clarify how it will work with and leverage the knowledge, capacity, and financial capacity of existing institutions including FAO, IFAD/ASAP, WFP, IFIs, the Global Environmental Facility, and the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, as well as other adaptation-focused funds with a large investment focus on food systems and agriculture such as the LDCF, the SCCF and the Adaptation Fund. The GCF should seek to clarify how it will contribute towards a more coherent, streamlined approach to dealing with the various institutional actors in this space. Otherwise, it risks further fragmentation in the sector with accompanying complexity for countries, companies, and others seeking to access finance.</p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Numerous discussions have been held with partners and discussions on strengthening collaboration continue.
General	<p>General comment: My suggestion is based on my personal studies and experience managing risks of agricultural emergencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Teach the communities how to prepare an agricultural continuity plan to manage risks of interruption of agricultural production, in order to integrate the three paradigm-shifting pathways. This will also involve definition of roles of public and private sectors followed by training of all. •At the end, a proper certification system would be created for locations capable of activating their respective continuity plans in a timely manner. 	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Agree, feedback is welcome. The suggestions are well embedded across all three pathways and specific details based on each context will be formulated at the project level.

General	<p>The fact that Agriculture and Food Security is the first of several other subjects is viewed positively. It is a critical and urgent subject. Although it is in draft format, sharing the document provides access to the Fund's broad lines of thinking on the subject of agriculture and potential investment areas. The sector's contextual circumstances, and the interface between agriculture and climate change, are presented in a very balanced way. This is in line with Brazil's own interpretation and viewpoints, whereby the top priority is to strengthen the resilience of production systems and mitigation measures, with controlling emissions also important where possible and appropriate. The document makes clear its prioritisation of small-scale production systems, due to their vulnerability, but also clearly presents the need for cross-cutting and complementary measures for all production types and scales (these can build resilience for agriculture and improve livelihoods for both the most vulnerable and food insecure farmers, as well as more well-off market-oriented farmers). The document also acknowledges that there is general interest in the sustainability of the sector, and that measures that contradict this are in fact contrary to sectoral interests and are isolated (agri-food businesses gain from supporting sustainability through capturing market share, potential price premiums, reducing reputation risk, improved bottom-line profits and ensuring long-term supply chain sustainability. Corporate social responsibility and greater investor support can also ensue). We hope that this balanced view will continue after the comments to be forwarded to the GCF are received.</p>	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	The feedback is appreciated
General	<p>To conclude the space for comments, I appreciate Mapa having an internal opportunity to analyse the GCF's proposal for lines of action (1. Promoting resilient agriculture; 2. Facilitating informed assistance and risk management services; 3. Reconfiguring the Food System), as well as the principles that guide the Fund's investments. Understanding how the Fund works, and the expected scenarios and principles, can offer guidance for developing very competitive proposals to reinforce measures in the national territory that strengthen the Brazilian farming sector, but also to improve the image of the Brazilian farming sector, as a benchmark and support for other developing countries in developing their own strategies. In addition, the proposals are highly cross-cutting, and are aligned with several priorities established by Mapa under its current administration. We therefore stress our interest being informed about how this document develops, together with the appendices due to be added during 2021, as well as any webinars mentioned in the documents forwarded with the document we have reviewed. The CMCA remains available for any clarifications, and to discuss this further if deemed appropriate by Mapa</p>	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	The feedback is appreciated
General	<p>The document has useful information but it is not drafted as a "guide". Under the UNFCCC, several guides have been produced that provide step-by-step guidance to countries. For example the National Adaptation Plans: Technical Guidelines for the National Adaptation Plan Process (https://unfccc/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/application/pdf/napt_echguidelines_eng_hig). The current document comes out as a "Concept Note" and not as a "Guide". Therefore, the document is a good "Resource Material" but not a "Guide."</p>	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated . The current guide seeks to set out the direction in each sector where GCF can make the biggest impact and achieve paradigm shift. The step by step guidance will follow at a later stage.
General	<p>Indicators for tracking adaptation progress and emissions measurement are not discussed at all in the document. Yet, from a climate change perspective M&E for adaptation and MRV for mitigation co-benefits will be critical. The document should guide countries on potential generic impact related adaptation and mitigation indicators that are amenable to aggregation at different scales (i.e., local, subnational, national and global) so as to feed into the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF) and the Global Stocktake (GST).</p>	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document
General	<p>Agriculture adaptation is the priority of developing countries and the focus of GCF support. Therefore, we suggest sector guide to focus on adaptation target and illustrate mitigation target in a balance way, in order to avoid enlarging financing gap between adaptation and mitigation in agriculture.</p>	Advisor to BM Xia Lyu	Feedback is welcome. Adaptation in the agriculture sector is prioritized, however the linkages and co-benefits from mitigation are highlighted where applicable as there are numerous synergies across the three pathways, especially in the food systems pathway.

General	Overall: please provide line numbers to allow for a more effective review process	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	The feedback is appreciated but will not be included in this version of the guide.
General	There were quite a few editorial errors which I have not addressed	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	A final edit will be conducted.
General	References are missing or in different formats: 1) references mentioned in the text are not available; 2) ref 3 must be wrong 3) refs 5 + 6 are missing	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well noted. Updates have been made accordingly. reference 3 is correct, and 5 and 6 have been inserted. References mentioned in the text have been updated and checked.
General	... In addition, in layout, attention needs to be paid to numbering the chapters and sub-chapters as well as easing the readers' task by separating and connecting different sections with colour codes etc.	GCF BM Advisor	Thank you. A final edit and layout will be carried out.
General	2. Other work referred to with no or incomplete references	GCF Secretariat	References have been updated and checked again
Executive Summary	Could be shortened by ca. 50%; the sectoral guide is only 33 pages and rather high level so a 4 page ES seems too much	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is appreciated but will not be considered for this version.
Executive Summary	Should this be "weather"? (i.e. immediate day-to-day changes and threats)	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is appreciated but will not be considered for this version.
Executive Summary	Suggest "meeting the" or "complying with the"	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is appreciated but will not be considered for this version.
Executive Summary	"Activities would include . . . energy sources and infrastructure on farms that reduce emissions . . ." Does this include solar PV pump systems in addition to bioenergy produced locally?	UNDP	yes this includes PV pumps as well
Executive Summary	"Production technologies and practices should be financially viable and climate-resilient, but may also focus on low-emissions agriculture, ensuring that interventions are not maladaptive or increasing risk." This sector guidance should also address the issue of government subsidies for conventional BAU agriculture which is fueling environmental degradation, habitat destruction and deforestation. This is a real issue in many of the countries we work in. Changes are needed to how the government supports ag/food via conventional subsidies and also existing programmes for farmer support, training and etc. True transformation towards long-term resilience will entail changes within government processes and systems that support the local ag/food processes. This is especially important for the more vulnerable and isolated areas ...	UNDP	Thank you for this point. Challenging subsidies and how to overcome such are well embedded across the guide and will be more specifically addressed at project level.
Executive Summary	... Also, production practices should also aim for regenerative outcomes (e.g. resilient agriculture is also regenerative). This is still not evident here. The paper should consider how the approaches (e.g. those listed above) that allow for improvements in agricultural yield and food production while addressing loss of soil, farm degradation and loss of critical ecosystem services, are part of the solution for resilient agriculture.	UNDP	Agree. The proposed pathways strongly wish to promote regenerative production systems.

Executive Summary	<p>" . . . reshaping supply chains, food retail, marketing, and procurement; reducing food loss and waste; shifting consumption towards healthier and more environmentally friendly, low-emission diets; and building supply chain resilience through e.g., reliable storage facilities."</p> <p>As mentioned above, working closely with national and sub national level government is crucial in ensuring that these interventions and transformation goes beyond one off activities in the project and are reflected at the policy and regulatory level that will ensure long-term transformation in these systems.</p>	UNDP	Agree, this is well embedded in the third pathway.
Executive Summary	<p>" . . . they ensure that food systems are sustainable, deforestation-free, and inclusive of all producers and consumers."</p> <p>Does this refer to sustainable in terms of food production or also ecologically and hydrologically sustainable? Furthermore, in addition to deforestation free, it should also avoid destruction and degradation of wetlands, peatlands and other natural ecosystems which are crucial in maintaining the remaining ecosystem services, upon which food production depends.</p>	UNDP	The feedback is welcome. the sentence refers to production being sustainable both in terms of production but also ecologically and hydrological sustainable. the wetlands and peatlands are well noted but will be covered by the ecosystems sector guide.
Executive Summary	<p>"Limited investment . . . in innovative financing structures and support for resilient agricultural SMEs . . ."</p> <p>This is true also in terms of lack of financing to support regenerative agriculture that minimizes negative impact on ecosystem services, and is at the same time building a more climate resilient agricultural value chain. This is particularly true in the African context.</p>	UNDP	Agree. Overcoming the limited access to finance at the small holder level is crucial.
Executive Summary	<p>"Transformational planning and programming"</p> <p>If the investments are to be transformational in the sector they need to take a food systems approach whereby all aspects from input management to production and post-production be comprehensively considered in relation to climate risk management in order that the risks of losses and damages across the value chain and entire food system be minimized.</p>	UNDP	Agree, this is well received and will be a part of the third pathway.
Executive Summary	<p>" . . . undertake policy changes such as subsidy reforms in an inclusive manner; and identify and design transformational climate investments in the agricultural and food security sector to realize their NDCs, National Action Plans (NAPs)."</p> <p>We would suggest to provide clear links between food and agriculture sectors and acknowledge landcover/land uses, so that transformational climate investments in ag/food either i) safeguard current flows of ecosystem services crucial for food production, or...</p>	UNDP	Agree, this is a key step and will be further explored in the food systems pathway going forward.
Executive Summary	<p>ii) restore those that are degraded through regenerative agriculture and silvo pastoral management to allow for the climate and earth system to rebalance over the long term.</p>	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	<p>"About three quarters of GCF agriculture projects are currently funded with grants for climate innovation . . ."</p> <p>It is worth noting that that adaptation objectives target the most affected and climate vulnerable farming communities that are mostly subsistence, have no financial literacy, assets, or collateral assets or access to financial services. Grant investments at scale often create such critical conditions and capacities to enable and attract additional finance with cascading effect. Importance of grand investments should not be discounted especially in the most marginal and isolated farming communities that are typically the most climate vulnerable and hence the primary target groups for adaptation efforts.</p>	UNDP	Grant projects are very important and can help transform the sector significantly. There is however an opportunity to boost projects and make use of all GCF's financial instrument to tackle current challenges.
Executive Summary	<p>"Coalitions and knowledge to scale up success"</p> <p>It would be helpful to know how this knowledge is to be generated. Would it be feasible to consider systematic impact evaluation programs (similar to the ones which we have some projects in) more broadly?</p>	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

Executive Summary	Some of our comments, if addressed in the main body of the guidance document, could also require some adjustment of Exec Sum language	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Not included
Executive Summary	CARE strongly welcomes that " Inclusion of women, youth and marginalized communities, including indigenous people, to increase productivity and profits and to engage the entire workforce. " is highlighted as a key intervention area	CARE International	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	In the 'The importance of the Agriculture Sector in climate adaptation and mitigation efforts' section, it states in the second paragraph 'creating millions of new jobs by improving value chains in agriculture'. We would like to add 'market mechanisms' to it, meaning that it is not only value chains that need to be improved, but also the market mechanisms currently in place that often disadvantage smallholder farmers and SMEs in fostering resilient, economically viable and localised market structures.	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated and the suggestion has been added to the executive summary.
Executive Summary	In the 'Paradigm-shifting pathways' section, it states in the second paragraph 'The first paradigm shifting pathway on Promoting Resilient Agriculture supports adaptation and climate-resilient interventions to reduce the shock of a changing climate on agricultural productivity, while promoting low emissions synergies, where possible and appropriate.' We consider the last four words to weaken the ambitions of the first pathway itself by leaving an easy 'backdoor' or excuse for those not willing to comply with the urgent need to promote low emissions synergies. Whilst we understand the need for context specificity and consideration of different starting points, we suggest to rephrase the sentence and instead say: '...while promoting low emissions synergies.	Both ENDS	Feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated and where possible and appropriate has been deleted across the document.
Executive Summary	In the same paragraph, it also states 'Interventions supporting adaptation and productivity can be targeted toward unique farmer groups and production value chain actors, and include improved climate-resilient varieties, ...'. We suggest to also include civil society as an actor and specify what is meant by 'improved climate-resilient varieties'? Improved by whom and which role are the previously mentioned actors take in that process? We suggest to frame it as follows: 'and include climate-resilient varieties which at the same time enrich and restore degraded ecosystems and improved in close consultation with and participation of farmers and other food producers, ...'.	Both ENDS	The feedback is welcome. The sentence has been updated in combination with other comments to the same section .
Executive Summary	Lastly, in the same paragraph it also states 'Production technologies and practices should be financially viable and climate-resilient, but may also focus on low-emissions agriculture, ensuring that interventions are not maladaptive or increasing risk'. Similar to number 2, also here the language used is rather discouraging by saying 'may also focus on low-emissions agriculture'. Instead, we suggest more encouraging and proactive language: 'Production technologies and practices should be financially viable and climate-resilient with additional attention on low-emissions agriculture, ensuring that interventions are not maladaptive or increasing risk	Both ENDS	The feedback is welcome. The sentence has been updated in combination with other comments to the same section .
Executive Summary	The third paragraph of this section ends with 'as well as more well-off market-oriented farmers.' To ensure that projects don't further exacerbate inter- and intracommunal- and/or household inequalities, we suggest to frame it differently and instead say: 'can build resilience for agriculture and improve livelihoods for both the most vulnerable and food insecure farmers, with positive spill over effects to more well-off market-oriented farmers.	Both ENDS	Feedback is welcome and the sentence has been updated accordingly.
Executive Summary	In the fourth paragraph it states 'It supports the food system in producing resilient and low emission sustainably produced food for rapidly growing populations.' Here, we suggest to add 'nutritious and culturally appropriate' as two important indicators of the food we would all like to see produced.	Both ENDS	Feedback is welcome and the sentence has been updated accordingly.

Executive Summary	Finally, in the same paragraph, it states 'they foster national food security and support domestic and international agri-food business'. Whilst we do recognise the importance of both those players, we would like to stress the importance of further strengthening the position of domestic agri-foodbusiness players in the Global South to establish themselves in local and international markets. Rather than placing them equally, we suggest to put empahsie on the former whilst not neglecting the latter, hence saying: 'foster national food security through support for subsistence farmers, local markets and domestic agri-food businesses and complementarity of international actors'.	Both ENDS	The feedback is welcome. The sentence has been updated in combination with other comments to the same section .
Executive Summary	In the 'Barriers and enablers to achieving these paradigm-shifting pathways in the Agriculture Sector' section, it states in the first paragraph 'the need to increase both the quantity and quality of food production'. We suggest to also add the key challenging of improving the distribution of food' to it, thus stating 'the need to improve the distribution of food and increase both the quality and quantity of food produced'.	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	In the 'Barriers and enablers to achieving these paradigm-shifting pathways in the Agriculture Sector' section, the lack of regenerative agricultural methods used in degraded areas such as drylands is not mentioned (for instance Farmer-Managed Natural Regeneration), while desertification is one of the biggest challenges when it comes to food security and sustainable land use the upcoming decades. It also comprises land which has potential for food production, but currently not used. Suggestion to add a barrier: the lack of regenerative agricultural methods used in degraded areas such as drylands	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	In the 'Barriers and enablers to achieving these paradigm-shifting pathways in the Agriculture Sector' section, the pathway-specific barriers would benefit from explicitly mentioning security of land tenure rights, as secure tenure rights enable farmers (especially women) to use their with a long-term perspective and contributes to food security. Suggestion to add to the second bullet point: Empowerment ofcommunities and localleadership, and increasing security of their (especially women's) land rights.	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	For consideration: two different effects of climate change should be mentioned, which have a direct impact on the agricultural sector: slow onset events (rising temperatures and rates of ET as well as changing precipitation patterns) and the occurrence of extreme weather events (e.g. droughts, heavy precipitation events, storms), which are projected to increase in both quantity and intensity, having negative impacts on agriculture as well.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	Unclarity on the analytical framework for paradigm shift: the document presents two levels of paradigm shift, at sectoral and then at project level, making it complicated to interpret paradigm shift, i.e. paradigm shift as an investment criteria but also paradigm shift as an approach to sectoral pathway shift. In this regard: 1) At project level, the draft IRMF introduces different dimensions of paradigm shift potential (scale, depth, sustainability) along with the sub-criteria of paradigm shift e.g. regulatory frameworks and policies, technology and innovation, market development and transformation and knowledge. 2) However, in this guidance, the focus of paradigm is sectoral and considers 4 elements, which are transformational planning and programming, catalyzing climate innovation, mobilization of finance at scale, and coalitions and knowledge to scale up success. The distinction should be clearly explained. Operational implications can also be further explained. Throughout the project cycle (not a sector), for instance, should AEs consider the first IRMF or the second approach (as presented in this paper)? Who is in charge of identifying which projects in a given sector contribute to that sectoral pathway? Furthermore, roles of partners (AE, GCF, Countries) in the operationalization of this guidance needs to be strengthened. Furthermore, how will the new IRMF be integrated into the guidance?	GIZ	Thank you for the comment. The guide seeks to first describe the overall challenge in the sector and the opportunity for achieving paradigm shift and identify where GCF funds can have the biggest impact. This is then translated at project level with specific examples and each project being submitted will then translate the guide to concrete interventions best suited in a given context.

Executive Summary	We recommend adding food processing - value addition offers a huge opportunity.	GIZ	The feedback is welcome. Food processing and value addition is part of the third pathway on reconfiguring food systems.
Executive Summary	Regarding pathway 1: Differentiation with pathway 3 is not clear – is “pathway 1” only about farm level interventions? A more systemic approach to agricultural landscapes would make sense - production technologies are only one aspect, while many approaches at landscape or community level also hold potential - multilevel approaches are required.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated. The three pathways should be promoted in parallel as they are interlinked. Pathway 3 depends on the success of both pathway 1 and 2 and is at the broader level across the food system and sub systems whereas pathway 1 and 2 are targeted more at the project level.
Executive Summary	It would be good to articulate how three pathways are considered as mutually exclusive, complementary or synergistic and to clearly state and guide project proponents about the possibility to have a project with a mix of those pathways.	GIZ	The feedback is welcome. The three pathways are interlinked and complementary. A paragraph on the interlinkages has been inserted in section 2, paradigm shifting pathways.
Executive Summary	For consideration: aAdaptation vs Cross cutting: some agriculture projects (i. with promotion of agro-forestry, no-till, etc) have a potential contribution to mitigation - when should a project integrate the mitigation co-benefits into the proposal as one objective/focal area? How is significant contribution defined? It is noteworthy that integrating mitigation into the projects will have implications on baseline calculations, methodologies, additional reporting etc.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated. this will on a project by project basis considering the opportunities for both mitigation and adaptation co benefits. All three pathways are cross cutting and should promote both adaptation and mitigation options where feasible and meeting the specific demands of the context.
Executive Summary	Pay attention to digital divide when it comes to female farmers and smallholder farmers!	GIZ	The feedback is welcome and embedded.
Executive Summary	... Please also consider adding the following: on cost of adaptation: according to the results of the flagship report of the Global Commission on Adaptation (GCA) investments in adaptation will pay back by the rate 1:4 in the future by reducing existing and future climate risks and strengthening the resilience of sectors and stakeholders.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	In addition, there are also structural barriers e.g. the lack of extension services capacities or the lack of enabling policy frameworks, basin or landscape planning, institutional capacities, etc. And those barriers are dependent on root causes. Most barriers mentioned focus on finance/investment aspects. Consider adding ‘lack of policy coherence and cross-sectoral coordination’. These issues address a broader range of governance and policy aspects + lack of ready-made tools to support the planning process e.g. smart subsidies (e.g. for decentralized energy sources), guidance/incentives for green recovery measures	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

Executive Summary	Capacities for planning go beyond the agricultural sector - a food systems perspective must cut across different sectors, hence multi-sectoral planning and coordination becomes critical, especially at national policy level	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	Questions for consideration: what is a climate resilient project: a project can be an agriculture project that is resilient? What kind of financial viability are we talking in the context of climate resilient projects? Are we looking for commercial viability (implies profits) or economic viability (profits are not a requirements, covering OPEX, debt, etc I enough)?	GIZ	Feedback is welcome. the sentence has been updated and rephrased based on other comments as well. the reference to the pipeline and financial viable have been removed
Executive Summary	Knowledge is needed also on the side of the private sector – they, too, need to switch to a longer-term approach and guide farmers to and incentivize more sustainable practices. Also lacking knowledge on the banking sectors' side to balance out risks in the agriculture portfolio	GIZ	Feedback is much appreciated. awareness raising of private sector and banking sector have been added to the sentence.
Executive Summary	For consideration: techDetector: Future of Agriculture (envisioning.io) – provides an overview of innovations. Innovations are beneficial but might e.g. destroy employment possibilities at the same time.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	Can you add some examples?	GIZ	Not included
Executive Summary	Here, a supranational perspective is also important - regional or continental trade regimes are also extremely important and might need to find more consideration.	GIZ	Feedback is welcome. regional and continental have been added to the sentence.
Executive Summary	Another factor is the limited access to land or the unsecure tenure rights in many countries, reducing the investments in sustainable management practices, especially in the medium and long term.	GIZ	feedback is appreciated. lack of secure land tenure has been added to the list of barriers.
Executive Summary	This figure is great to see where projects are contributing at the country (NAP type) level.	GIZ	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	Systems need to be transformed to build resilience to climate impacts, but also made them environmentally sustainable.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. This is well embedded across the three pathways.
Executive Summary	This is incomplete. Should it read: reducing biodiversity loss	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received and the corrections have been made. The sentence now reads reducing biodiversity loss...
Executive Summary	Women or youth are not necessarily 'marginalized' group	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. including women and youth have been deleted.
Executive Summary	While fertilizer production should become more sustainable, fertilizer input per se should be reduced, e.g. through agro-ecology approaches.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. a sentence on reducing fertilizer inputs has been added.

Executive Summary	What does this mean?	GCF BM Advisor	The sentence refers to the fact that the reconfiguring food systems can foster a change in the production, processing, storage, transportation and consumption of food commodities.
Executive Summary	One of the barriers is that agriculture remains often with inadequate attention in national climate change strategies and action plans, including National Adaptation Plans.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is welcome. The sentence has been added to the paragraph highlighted.
Executive Summary	These are examples of the “practices, technologies and business models – but it’s not an exhaustive list.	GCF BM Advisor	FEedback is well received. indeed this list will be further elaborated going forward. Such as has been included in the sentence to underline that the list is not exclusive.
Executive Summary	This is very broadly formulated. What do you mean with this?	GCF BM Advisor	The feedback is well received. The sentence has been rephrased, to highlight that capacity building targeting different stakeholder groups and demands is needed.
Executive Summary	A large part of the information provided below is generic information about GCF and not specific for the agricultural sector, including Figure 1. This information should be the same in all sectoral guidance papers – perhaps in a “chapeau paper”? Sectoral guidance paper should then be as concise as possible.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. the guide follows the set template and outline all sectors use.
Executive Summary	Is this meant to be National Adaptation Plans?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received and the corrections have been made, to be National Adaptation Plans.
Executive Summary	Are “weather index insurances” “innovative financing instruments”....?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is welcome. The sentence refers to one example being weather index insurances that has proven to be very succesful. There are of course many other innovative instruments, that exist across the portfolio and pipeline.
Executive Summary	A large part of the information provided below is generic information about GCF and not specific for the agricultural sector. This information should be the same in all sectoral guidance papers – perhaps in a “chapeau paper”? Sectoral guidance paper should then be as concise as possible.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. the guide follows the set template and outline all sectors use.
Executive Summary	Although the full document does mention extension services needs coupled with climate information, the executive summary leaves this point out. I would suggest adding the barrier of limited mention of extension service support required by farmers to actually change their practices. Access to climate information alone cannot improve actions on the ground, they need to be packed with extension services that provide finance and know-how to farmers so that they can adapt. For example, if forecasts suggest a shorter rainy season, farmers need access to short season varieties and finance to purchase these.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is well received. A reference to extension services and climate information has been added in the executive summary.
Executive Summary	Building on this point, the second paradigm could be framed more broadly to be inclusive of action to address the science/policy/action gaps, ensure information is usable/accessible timely, and enhance support and capacity at subnational levels (linking back to extension) to act on the climate information and risk management services. Broader language for the second paradigm also seems more in line with the scope of the first and third.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. Please refer to the climate information and early warning systems sectoral guide for further details.

Executive Summary	Also, suggest taking into account similar and/or relevant numerous (e.g. climate smart agriculture) guidelines developed by other international organizations and donors as well as relevant donors' experience from funded projects (e.g. in referenced pilot countries) which might have helped to distill and apply field broad knowledge.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. The proposed guide is built on an extensive review of the existing literature.
Executive Summary	May want to introduce the concept of also avoiding actions that reinforce undesired resilience (e.g. Dornelles et al 2020 https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/global-sustainability/article/towards-a-bridging-concept-for-undesirable-resilience-in-socialecological-systems/1ABE13D16F6AE2599AC5B6654E4D689F	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	If this section is mitigation focused to complement the resilience section above having that more explicit may be useful for applicants.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. All three pathways are cross cutting.
Executive Summary	Given we also want avoided deforestation in highly vulnerable area e.g. for watershed protection or due to habitat shifts in mountainous regions, would that fall under the Ag section above?	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback well received. The ag sector guide is linked to the forest and land use and ecosystem and ecosystem services guides which address the issues of deforestation, watershed protection more in detail.
Executive Summary	May want further clarification.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. Friendly has been replaced by sustainable. The sentence refers to diets being not being more healthy but based on the production of goods from sustainable farming systems and practices
Executive Summary	There is also no mention of water footprints or water use efficiency in the summary.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is well received. The water issues will be dealt with in the water sector guide.
Executive Summary	Is the goal deforestation free supply-chains? If it is indeed for the whole food systems the complexity of this may need to be further broken down to guide applicants.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is well appreciated. The specific interventions needed to reach deforestation free supply chains are context specific and will be dealt with in the individual proposals.
Executive Summary	safety and nutrition of food could be included here as well in addition to quality	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Safety and nutrition of food is highly relevant and is further addressed in the pathway descriptions.
Executive Summary	I would be helpful to know how the authors see the magnitude of this challenge in relation to limited access to technical support and capacity development opportunities. Maybe the framing could be broadened.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	The phrasing here sounds as though the goal of inclusion is to enhance farm output. This could be flipped, ensuring inclusion of women/youth/marginalized to ensure their rights and empowerment towards the goals they set. Could also be a shift in what is grown and the impact of profits earned on development outcomes as envisioned by these groups.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated to now also include shift in production of goods and overall empowerment.

Executive Summary	While recognizing that the focus of this guide is on resilience, the guide should also capture mitigation benefits, and should endeavor to ensure alignment between resilience outcomes and reductions in emissions from agriculture.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated. The guide balances across adaptation and mitigation, with the three pathways including interventions from both mitigation and adaptation aspects.
Executive Summary	Although N2O, CH4, and other non-CO2 gases are the primary GHGs related to agricultural production, CO2 should be included and highlighted, as part of the "reconfiguring" of the world's agriculture should capture a wide variety of actions related to food production, transport, storage, processing, etcetera.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	FEedback is welcome. The sentence has been corrected to now include both CO2 and non CO2 gases.
Executive Summary	This kind of consumption/demand-side approach seems to vastly broaden the scope of what would be covered	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is welcome. The paragraph refers to the overall direction and potential of the pathways
Executive Summary	I would remove this qualifier which is not what Parties have interpreted relevant language to convey	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is welcome. the reference to 100 billion annually has been removed.
Executive Summary	Capturing total global spending on agriculture might be useful to demonstrate possible resources available if finance is climate-aligned	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is welcome. The reference to 100 billion has been removed.
Executive Summary	This framing is debatable, as it is not always the lack of financial resources preventing development of pipeline. The role of enabling environments beyond finance should be highlighted	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is welcome. The paragraph has been rephrased and partly deleted.
Executive Summary	Interesting and relevant report but possibly more focused to middle income countries rather than LDCs? Creating millions of jobs, opportunities for marginalized groups is also based on a minimal of infrastructure like a financial banking system, stable telecommunication system, access to stable energy, nondiscriminatory policies for gender, an extension and research service, access to inputs like seeds and fertilizer, an existing but growing private sector, relative stable public sector etc. In other words, suggestions and possibilities rely on an existent and stable infrastructure that allows these developments to flourish. This infrastructure is not always existent in several LDCs especially out in the countryside.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is welcome. The current guide will be further elaborated with anenxes tailored specifically to project developers (countries, NDAs, AEs) in particular focusing on LDCs and SIDs.
Executive Summary	In other words, the examples and focus are more on developing countries which have an established (but weak) infrastructure. Then we have countries and regions which lack access to all the needed infrastructure to be able to make a paradigm shift.	GCF Alternative BM	Thank you for the feedback. These are only examples in the summary but indeed there are countries and regions where infrastructure and needs are different. The three pathways present a general overview of the best interventions and then specific context based solutions will be presented at the project level.
Executive Summary	For these countries and regions, the approach must be much more basic - focused on the people themselves. On establishing women's groups, establishing farmer organizations, access to different inputs, access to seed variety, support to private and public sector, extension services, etc. Provide markets and/or alternative income generating possibilities etc. The poorest are often the groups that go into the forest to access agricultural land - how can GCF and partners help these people with a meaningful and sustainable income for them not to move again for another piece of property. The only access to external contact is at most a radio and in some areas text messages through mobile.	GCF Alternative BM	Agree. Please see response above.

Executive Summary	These three are indeed important but of somewhat different character. #1 and #3 are both related to ambitions / goals, #1 could be seen as a part of #3, and #2 is a means to achieve the ends in #1 and #3. Suggest reorganizing to 1) Reconfiguring food systems; 2) Promoting resilient agriculture; 3) Facilitating climate informed advisory and risk management services to reflect this.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is welcome. The three pathways are interlinked and should be promoted in parallel and share many of the same specific interventions. The scope of this sector guide doesn't allow to go into full details across the three pathways. A short paragraph has been added to highlight how they are interlinked and should be used as one and not separated approaches.
Executive Summary	We would like to suggest adding "loss of biological diversity" as follow: "The key challenge faced in the agricultural and food security sector is ... with the context of a changing climate and loss of biological diversity". FAO's State of the World's Biodiversity for Food and Agriculture states that many species that contribute to ecosystem services that are vital to food and agriculture are rapidly disappearing. Biodiversity for food and agriculture is all the organisms that support food production through ecosystem services. This includes all the plants, animals and micro-organisms that keep soils fertile, pollinate plants, purify water and air, and fight crop pests and diseases. This draft should also provide guidance on the type of measures that are necessary to stop the loss of biodiversity for food and agriculture.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is welcome. The loss of biological diversity has been added. Biodiversity for food and agriculture and overall services will be further dealt with by the ecosystems and ecosystem services sectoral guide.
Executive Summary	It is unclear whether this section contains analytical background or elements which proposals are expected to relate explicitly to.	GCF Alternative BM	Feedback is welcome. The section follows a standard template used for all sectoral guides and is an introduction of GCF and its approach to achieving paradigm shift.
Executive Summary	This language suggests that proposals need to relate mainly to these 6 investment criteria and that the categories above are presented for analytical purposes?	GCF Alternative BM	Feedback is welcome. The paragraph refers to the 6 investment criteria and how they can be assess achieved within the agriculture and food security sector. the four paragraphs above related to the overall achievement of paradigm shift and are described in all sectoral guides but formulated from the specific point of view of the individual sector.
Executive Summary	See comments in the sections below. One of the pathways needs to consider the potential of the ag sector on mitigation and hence climate smart agriculture. This pathway could be restructured in such a way, but needs to give much more focus also on the named and positive mitigation options in agriculture (agroforestry, use of fertilizers, soil treatment, etc)	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated. The pathway includes the listed mitigation options, these are also found in pathway 3 and all three pathways are linked and should be promoted in parallel. Mitigation is well embedded in all three.
Executive Summary	Where is the whole potential / section on animal production and the needed mitigation activities in this regard?	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

Executive Summary	While this is true – certain standards such a soil management can help strongly with increasing droughts while at the same time increasing the mitigation potential of the activities. This should be highlighted as well.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is welcome. A reference to soil management has been added to the paragraph.
Executive Summary	We believe that this paragraph is out of context here, as sectoral guidelines are not meant to provide an assessment of the current financial commitments under the Paris Agreement. Furthermore no specific source of information is provided. We request to delete this paragraph.	gisella.berardi@mef.gov.it	Feedback is well received. The reference to the 100 billion has been deleted.
Executive Summary	The private sector is rightly identified as central, but guidance based on a ‘market-oriented approach’ and the analysis of private sector barriers (and therefore capacity building areas) could be elaborated upon, e.g.: -Pathway 1: Beyond describing the benefits of agricultural practices such as improved crop varieties, markets barriers faced by the private sector in the adoption of these technologies need to be acknowledged and addressed. -Pathway 2: The focus areas of capacity building for the private sector to be able to fully utilize and benefit from better climate advisory systems need to be outlined. -Pathway 3: It would be important to highlight the customized capacity building measures that would be needed for agri-food actors along the value chain, especially for smaller cooperatives, agri-enterprises and smallholder farming communities	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	A change towards vegetable production might ‘improve’ food production more than an ‘increase’ in meat production	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Thank you. Comment is well received. Changes in diets, and alternatives to seek for further diversification is important and in particular the food systems pathway will address this.
Executive Summary	the focus of the GCF should be on mitigation and adaptation, this should be reflected in the framing	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is appreciated. The paragraph and guide target both mitigation adaptation. A short reference has been added to highlight that the interventions are both adaptation and mitigation.
Executive Summary	lack of awareness of low-emissions agricultural practices and its benefits would be another important barrier, in addition to the lack of access to finance	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback appreciated. The suggestion has been added.
Executive Summary	While we agree to everything that is written here, specific attention should be given to the special circumstances and realities of subsistence farmers. They are often the poorest and most marginalized people. Sentences such as “innovative, high-potential business models, technologies, practices, and financing instruments with potential to scale”, however, might seem to be a bit out of touch with or not readily applicable in the context of the realities that many subsistence farmers face on the ground	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated. A reference to subsistence farmers has been added to the paragraph.
Executive Summary	Fits with the paradigm shift objective of this document	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	A specification might be adequate	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The sentence has been updated and now include example of the farmer groups, e.g. subsistence, medium size, larger etc.

Executive Summary	Not as a 1 st example, it's not a shift, it is only an incremental adaptation, and if only this practice is applied, it will not be enough	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is welcome. the sentence is only one of many opportunities indicating many practices should be done in parallel to be successful.
Executive Summary	Importance of an efficient cold chain	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is welcome. Cold chains have been added in the sentence. Cold chains will be dealt with in more detail by the energy sectoral guide.
Executive Summary	When appropriate	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	"in the agriculture sector and food systems" might be more adequate	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received and the wording has been updated accordingly.
Executive Summary	One way to meet this increasing demand for food is also to reduce food lost and waste. Intensifying agricultural production is one thing but we should also keep in mind that currently 1/3 of agricultural production is lost or wasted	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received. Food loss and waste has been added to the sentence.
Executive Summary	Would "Mitigation" be more appropriate?	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received.mitigation has been added to the sentence as there are numerous co-benefits. The first pathway has also been changed to 'promote resilient agroecology'
Executive Summary	Importance of an efficient cold chain to reduce food loss	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. Cold chains will be further addressed in other relevant sectors.
Executive Summary	France supports a sustainable intensification of agriculture	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	"Sector experts"- Define who these experts are and how the list of experts will be expanded to include, for example, practitioners (i.e. farmers, indigenous peoples, women, local communities, etc.), CSOs or NGOs who have long experience working on the subject or working with practitioners.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Not included

Executive Summary	The sentence, "Since most agriculture is rainfed in developing countries, climate change directly impacts agriculture by increasing temperatures and changing when and how much it rains," is oversimple and fails to account for the multiple impacts (both direct and indirect) climate change has on agriculture, from the spread of invasive species and the timing and incidence of seed germination to the devastating impacts of exacerbated natural disasters. Rather than reducing the climate/agriculture connection to the timing, intensity, and quantity of rain, it should be reframed to acknowledge that climate change is directly and indirectly affecting agriculture. This sentence also implies that climate change is not an issue when agriculture is not rainfed, which is patently untrue as irrigated agriculture is also subject to pressures from climate change.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. Rainfed agriculture is mentioned here as a general description of where the majority of the world's farming system fit in. it is fully noted that there are many different farming systems across the world and each with specific needs and opportunities.
Executive Summary	This sentence, "Most of the seeds, animals, and farming practices providing the world's food are less productive as the climate changes, having been developed for past climates" is problematic and should be removed in favor of a reframing. Less productive is a subjective, loaded word: less productive per what criteria? This phrasing implicitly opens the door to GMOs as the "solution" to improve seed productivity, when instead this paragraph should be framed through the lens of how climate change is threatening food security and food sovereignty (through multiple pathways) and how we collectively, including marginalized groups, Indigenous Peoples, women, and youth, can all be part of the adaptation solutions. It also implicitly overlooks the importance of traditional knowledge as a source of solutions. It also seems to overlook the benefits of the restoration and trading of original seeds.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. the sentence has been updated and combined with other feedback.
Executive Summary	Clearly defined and enforced land tenure and equal access to land are also important prerequisites for the effective implementation of policy instruments to promote sustainable land use systems. This aspect should be mentioned among the enabling conditions and possible activities more clearly throughout the document.	Board Member	Feedback is welcome. Tenure is referred to in the pathway 1 on promoting resilient agriculture.
Executive Summary	We believe the three cross-pathway actions that we highlighted in yellow should be the priority areas of intervention for the GCF in this sector, and investment efforts should focus on creating or enabling environments that can effectively help to address these challenges.	Board Member	The feedback is welcome. The three pathways should be promoted in parallel and are fully interlinked. one intervention in one pathway will also help achieve the goals of the other two pathways.
Executive Summary	By expressing that the main challenge for food security is to produce more in terms of quantity and (export-focused)quality, the text lacks the recognition that food systems are also inefficient in terms of distribution. For some scholars, particularly those studying famines, the evidence is clear we do not need to focus on more production but on better distribution and more equitable re-distribution with respect to access to agricultural resources. The focus on productivity growth is a direct outcome of the too narrow and biased focus in the narrative of market-driven and technological food systems which are promoted excessively in the document.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

Executive Summary	<u>It is stated for the first time the "lack of adequate finance to develop a pipeline of commercially viable climate-resilient projects and programs" as one of the main barriers to achieving the agricultural sector's paradigm-shifting pathways. However, it is also important to include here the need to promote the adequate allocation and effective investment of financial resources available and redirection of investment to climate-resilient agricultural activities, while also removing the term "commercially", which is biased against grant-based adaptation funding, a key funding instrument of the GCF. The key challenge faced in the agricultural and food security sector is the lack of finance needed to increase both the quantity and quality of food production to help stop hunger, while reducing the sector's environmental footprint and achieving these objectives with the context of a changing climate. Ceres2030's new research shows that by doubling their investments between now and 2030, donors could help end hunger, double smallholder farmer incomes and protect the climate: https://ceres2030.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/ceres2030_launch-summary-report.pdf</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	Opening paragraph clearly defines what the guide is about	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	Background information is detailed enough to provide an effective overview of agriculture & food security and the role of the GCF in financing paradigm shifting pathways	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	Figure ES.1 is well done, provides clarity in a "snap shot" of sorts	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Agree
Executive Summary	Suggest to define "paradigm shift" in a specific breakout box for all parties to understand. For the private sector, we suggest defining it as something like "systemic change" as the PS understands systems thinking well, but will struggle to understand the term paradigm shifting - even though you do define it and linking it to 'systems thinking' will make PS better understand the interconnectedness and how the GCF wants the transformation of entire systems - not just one technology	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received. The different sector guides follow the same template and will include a short overview of paradigm shift within their respective sectors. the private sector part is well noted and will be further explored in the next versions.
Executive Summary	Reformulate "Inclusion of women, youth and marginalized communities, including indigenous people[s], to increase productivity and profits and to engage the entire workforce." to "Inclusion of women, youth and marginalized communities, including indigenous peoples, to help ensure access to safe and nutritious food and equitable outcomes in a changing climate, including through increasing their assets and adaptive capacity, productivity and promoting gender equality." This is in line with our overarching comments indicating concern about the overfocus on jobs and productivity for these groups rather than on livelihoods, food security, and food sovereignty.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but has not been included at this stage.
Executive Summary	We would say "inclusion and empowerment", not only inclusion	World Food Programme (WFP)	Feedback is welcome. empowerment has been added
Executive Summary	add: "At the same time humanity is also challenged with an unprecedented loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services where current food production systems constitutes one of the major drivers behind this loss." after "...stresses on access to safe, affordable, and nutritious foods."	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is welcome and has been added to the sentence.
Executive Summary	replace with "Most of the conventional and modern seeds..."	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated accordingly.

Executive Summary	add "and usually not for climatic specific contexts."	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated accordingly.
Executive Summary	delete ", where possible and appropriate"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated accordingly.
Executive Summary	add "and not driving loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services."	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated accordingly.
Executive Summary	add "and local"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated accordingly.
Executive Summary	add "of crops"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence refers to crops as well.
Executive Summary	replace with "financially viable, climate-resilient and not driving biodiversity loss."	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	add "the use of locally adapted seeds and other resources"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	add "production and increased use of local resource systems"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	replace with "national markets"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. national markets has been added in connection with domestic and international agri food business
Executive Summary	add "both increase in sustainability and"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	add "and not over using or degrading natural resources and ecosystem services"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	replace with "loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	Can we consider rephrasing to "soil and water management, and land governance"?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated
Executive Summary	It would be good to briefly list the criteria here (or in a footnote)	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. the 6 investment criteria have been added in the sentence.
Executive Summary	RESILIENCE is the keyword, the most used in the document. In other words, is the capacity of agriculture (especially family farming) to withstand the impact of climate change, and to continue producing with low CO2 emissions. But the document does not say that agriculture, especially agroecology, sequester CO2 from the air to transform it into productive input on land.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	FEedback is appreciated. the guide promotes both adaptation and mitigation options across the three pathways. Agro ecology is well embedded across all three pathways including opportunities to sequester CO2 and the first pathway now has a new focus and title on promoting resilient agroecology.
Executive Summary	In terms of agroecological family farming, financial viability comes from the production of high quality (organic) surpluses for direct marketing to allied urban consumers - "Real Food"	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received

Executive Summary	Critical information about the climate (daily, rain forecasts, etc.) can and should be disseminated regularly, via the Internet (whatsapp - Technical Assistance and Rural Extension Companies already have groups. YouTube - Technical Assistance and Rural Extension Companies and CSOs have diffusion channels, FB, Instagram, Radio and TV programs (like Globo Rural in Brazil).	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	It is very useful to associate loss reduction with social food programs for low-income people - in addition to maintaining, of course, healthy and organic School Food programs, distribution in nursing homes, homeless people, slums, etc.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received
Executive Summary	for this to happen, Food Education must be promoted in schools (in addition to organic meals) and for the students' families, promoting access to organic food, organic cooking classes, and even basic processing for local marketing.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Comment well received. education and general awareness raising is part of all three pathways, in particular in pathway three on reconfiguring food systems.
Executive Summary	It is necessary to create alternatives to the "large supermarkets" model. One idea is to promote an alliance between agroecological farmers and urban grocers (this has already been done in Bogotá), to bring organic food to the peripheral population, who are unable to go to organic fairs (as they are usually in middle class neighborhoods, which have better purchasing power and nutritional information)	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	feedback is well received. the guide promotes partnerships at all levels, and scales to meet the specific context derived demands. the alliance between farmers and urban grocers is well noted and is embedded in the pathway 3.
Executive Summary	In Brazil, it is necessary to revitalize Conab`s warehouses, and the PAA - Food Acquisition Program; promote synergy with truck drivers for fast transportation (otherwise there is waste) and participatory distribution schemes	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.
Executive Summary	It is essential to FIGHT AGAINST DEFORESTATION !!!! Ensure trained and motivated inspectors and their safety. Media campaigns and public engagement	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well noted. the supply chains will be promoted to be deforestation free. This aspect will be further discussed in the forest and land use sectoral guide.
Executive Summary	to reduce the ecological footprint it is necessary to promote the local product, discourage imports and invest in local creative cuisine	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received and this is fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.
Executive Summary	Establish Participatory Planning mechanisms - with all economic and social actors with voice.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. Participatory planning has been added.
Executive Summary	Structuring a wide information network - we have already talked about the Internet, TV, radio programs, publication of informative POSTERS, booklets, videos on YouTube, etc	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind information services mentioned in the guide.
Executive Summary	Agroecological Business Models have an impact on people's health and food, on the health and well-being of farmers, on the regeneration of the environment and on the participation of consumers and distributors.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.
Executive Summary	As mentioned earlier, access to the Internet is essential for farmers (as well, but easier, for distributors, consumers, processors, storage, transporters, etc.). For farmers, the Internet is a source of information, technical assistance, for training (distance learning courses), for sharing and building knowledge, for commercialization, for dialogue with friendly consumers, etc.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.

Executive Summary	Agricultural credit systems are stuck by the banks that operate them, privileging large landowners and sabotaging small ones. This has to be changed by creating Agricultural Credit Councils in Banks, with equal participation from peasants, represented by their organizations and cooperatives.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	Scalability must be a criterion in promoting programs and projects - good experience, good practice must be disseminated and implemented as a form of economy.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.
Executive Summary	Hyper-necessary recommendation!!! It can be achieved by transforming the current Rural Extension Technical Assistance -from-top-to-bottom into a dialectic and emancipatory rural extension, which promotes not only technical but also social aspects - egalitarian gender relations and the promotion of women, promotion of creativity and access to youth knowledge, exchanges between communities and exchange of good practices, encouragement and prizes for innovative practices and ideas, strengthening of community organization and cooperatives.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.
Executive Summary	Engage new companies with ecological concerns that are emerging, so that they could become agents of development, and gradually access a wider public	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.
Executive Summary	Promoting coalitions and knowledge sharing is essential! With Universities and Technical Schools, with CSOs, such as social movements, with thinkers from other areas - marketing, communication, education, philosophy, etc.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the comments are fully embedded in the thinking behind the guide.
Executive Summary	Does this mean standalone viability? If that were the case why is GCF funding needed?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is welcome. Where feasible has been added to the sentence to highlight that GCF supports taking risks but also supports projects where there is an existing technology or practice financially viable that can be scaled up.
Executive Summary	While getting climate information and seasonal weather forecast to farmers is indeed important, we consider that a potentially bigger challenge is capacitating any form of viable agricultural advisory service, particularly to producers who are outside the sphere of commercial agriculture and interested agribusiness. E.g. Extension services have been going backwards for years with insufficient attention and investment from government, the wrong incentives and an increasing over-reliance on private sector engagement which favours the better endowed farmers at the expense of the marginal. A more holistic support to strengthen the whole system could be to look at support for the Extension service as a whole encompassing climate and weather information services. And looking at what is needed to boost skills and knowledge, (of extension workers and farmers) to create the information and knowledge links to farmers and between farmers.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Agree, thank you for the comment. Overcoming the lack of extension and access to services is addressed by all three pathways.
Executive Summary	The lack of capacity to develop this pipeline is itself a barrier to include.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The adequate finance for a pipeline has been deleted and included in the second barrier in combination with investments. Lack of capacity has been added to the sentence.
Executive Summary	The lack of secure land tenure is also a barrier.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated. The sentence has been updated

Executive Summary	Another barrier is the limited public investment in the enabling environment of the highest risk and climate vulnerable areas that would provide the services and incentives farmers need to improve production, and businesses need to invest in the sector. There needs to be sufficient investment in roads, energy, clean water, education, health care, financial services, to incentivise the private sector to engage with agricultural producers in the most threatened regions. That is alluded to in the following section on pathways to an enabling environment, but this could be spelled out more clearly, including setting out how GCF is engaging with countries on this challenge.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Agree, many thanks for raising this. The pathways provide the overall direction but specific details related to context as well and country based will be developed at the project/programme level when submitted.
Executive Summary	It is key to review and innovate financial instruments, including a more effective diversification and innovation for GCF investments in potentially revenue generating activities./projects in the agriculture sector, in agriculture (e.g., use of concessional loans schemes, including at community-based levels). Grants should mainly be used for adaptation in smallholder, low-income farming communities.	Board Member	Agree, this is very important. The sectoral guide stimulates use of all of GCF's financial instruments and the future review of concept notes and funding proposals will also highlight this important point.
Executive Summary	There hasn't been a mention of gender so far. Part of the transformational work should be to focus on the gendered aspect of climate and agriculture.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is appreciated. Gender mainstreaming is embedded across all sectoral guides and in particular across the three pathways.
Executive Summary	Are high impact actions likely to be those that take place where the enabling conditions mentioned above are robust? If so, is there a hazard that investment flows to more stable places than flowing to areas that need assistance on establishing the enabling conditions as a precursor?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	the feedback is well received. The investments to be made will in principle be where there are risks, and no other support as well in areas with enabling environment but difficult to scale up an existing approach. further guidance targeted to specific context in which GCF operates will be developed with the targeted activities specific to the individual context
Executive Summary	Overall Pastoralism and livestock management should be more prominent. These are the major livelihoods in a lot of low income countries (esp: Sahel, Greater Horn, Central Asia) but these are insufficiently addressed and noted as of importance. Livestock management, animal healthcare and maintaining a viable mobility are all important in productivity terms but also in terms of sustainable environmentally friendly production.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Executive Summary	"The cost of adaptation in agriculture alone will be more than \$100 billion per year." Please provide reference for this statement.	UNDP	Thank you. The sentence of 100 billion has been deleted.
Executive Summary	Please add the source (citation). ...	GIZ	Thank you. The sentence of 100 billion has been deleted.
Executive Summary	could these annexes to be already part of this document?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received but will not be included.
Executive Summary	What is the source of this information?	GCF BM Advisor	Thank you. The sentence of 100 billion has been deleted.

Introduction	The table does not mention the Cities guide, although the equivalent table in the Cities guide mentions agriculture.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received, but will not be included.
Introduction	Why does this paragraph not match the equivalent paragraph in the Cities Sectoral Guide?	GCF Secretariat	A final edit will be conducted to ensure consistency.
Introduction	In the above table, under energy efficiency, we could add a reference to efficient cold chain. It is probably addressed in the sectoral guide on energy efficiency	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Introduction	"Agriculture is central to food security, livelihoods, and economic development, especially in low-income countries." We would like to note that agriculture globally is central to these objectives across all countries; if the demand side for certain types of agricultural products from richer countries isn't addressed, the battle to transform agricultural production in developing countries will be all the more challenging. As such, this is not only a concern for low-income countries.	UNDP	The feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated and low income countries deleted.
Introduction	"Agroforestry . . . livestock and manure management . . ." Please note that in several smallholder contexts, livestock is also a source of draft power.	UNDP	Feedback is appreciated. This is well embedded across the three pathways.
Introduction	"Forest protection at the agricultural frontier" This should also promote deforestation free agriculture; it is not only about the frontier but conversion and expansion into the new arable lands through deforestation.	UNDP	Agree. Deforestation free agriculture is crucial, and will primarily be supported through the food systems pathway and also supported through the forest sector guide.
Introduction	"Fisheries and fishery supply chain management . . ." Please clarify the direct link between agricultural interventions and impact in fisheries.	UNDP	Feedback is welcome. Fisheries will be dealt with in the ecosystems sectoral guide.
Introduction	"Fisheries and fishery supply chain management; peatland; land restoration for ecosystem services; watershed management" We suggest for GCF to also consider adding/acknowledging the following: 1) preventing further conversion of wetlands and other types of ecosystems into agric areas or pasture land In addition to forest protection; and 2) wetland protection and restoration. Considering the rate of loss of peatlands and wetlands to agriculture and knowing that these are associated with both carbon emissions and the loss of vital ecosystem services, we advise for GCF to discuss and acknowledge these links. For example, see: Wetlands Disappearing Three Times Faster than Forests UNFCCC < https://unfccc.int/news/wetlands-disappearing-three-times-faster-than-forests >	UNDP	Thank you for the feedback. These other ecosystems will be dealt with in other sectoral guides, i.e. forest and land use and ecosystems.
Introduction	A food systems perspective is key - changes are not only required in the agricultural production, and challenges and approaches cut across sectoral divides. The guide largely focuses on agriculture, and food systems focus is not always clear. A more systemic approach might make more sense.	GIZ	Feedback is well received. The food systems pathway offers a very holistic and broad approach to achieve paradigm shift across agriculture, forest, ecosystems and broader landscapes where agricultural production plays a significant role.

Introduction	The Climate information and Early Warning system sector guide seems to be also of extreme relevance, in particular for the pathway two on: Facilitating Climate Informed Advisory and Risk Management	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Introduction	Does this mean: 1. food and nutrition security or 2. food safety and nutrition	GCF BM Advisor	The feedback is well received. The paragraphs refers to food security and nutrition in this particular context. A correction has been made in the table.
Introduction	Underpinning all agricultural systems is water management (rain fed, groundwater dependent or surface water dependent). Climate change will exacerbate pressures in agricultural systems in drought prone and flood prone regions requiring adaptation strategies. Improved water management can also support soil health and enhance carbon storage in soils -- supporting mitigation goals.	The Nature Conservancy	Agree, this is crucial. Water management is embedded across the pathways, but specific details on water issues will be dealt with in the water sectoral guide.
Introduction	Traditional knowledge should be integrated into climate planning for agricultural systems particularly for indigenous communities and is particularly important for tropical agricultural systems and grazing systems in places like Africa and Latin America.	The Nature Conservancy	The feedback is welcome. Traditional knowledge is a key aspect in scaling up. traditional knowledge has been added to the sentence on page 3 regarding actions to create enabling environment.
Introduction	Why are agriculture, food systems and food security relevant to climate action? Is better suited	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Not included
Introduction	In line with our overarching comments, the introduction should make it clear that because of the dominance of women in local food production and in rainfed smallholder agriculture (often without land holdings and title), and extreme gender differences in access to agricultural extension services and finance provision, a gendered lens needs to be applied in a cross-cutting manner. (Note: in the draft guide, the word "women" appears first on page 11, in the context of applying the SDGs; this comment stresses the importance of an earlier, introductory inclusion as this is critical to envisioning the entire set of guidance.)	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
Introduction	Challenges of small scale farmers and producers are not only confined to poverty, climate change, etc. There should also be an acknowledgement from the document that there is a glaring challenge on food security and sovereignty stemming from encroachment of extractive industries in agricultural areas/ production areas. Without this recognition in the sector guidance, it misses the opportunity to correct it by ensuring human rights in food sovereignty.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

Introduction	<p>This is missing a clear reference to a human rights framework and to the “right to food.” The GCF has a focus on vulnerable communities, on safeguarding food security, and on ending hunger; therefore, there must be a reference to the human rights framework in this GCF sectoral guidance. It is necessary to include an explicit recognition of the progressive realization of the right to food as well as a recognition of the rights of rural women.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>
Introduction	<p>We welcome the attention to evidence-based learning but suggest amendments given the importance of participatory, and very practical experience, and inclusion of indigenous and traditional knowledge, which has also been highlighted in Art. 7.5 of the Paris Agreement: "Evidence-based learning knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation through strong science, data, participatory monitoring, research and innovation that links the three paradigm-shifting pathways, also taking into account indigenous and traditional knowledge". Overall the document has very little mention or reference to indigenous peoples and never mentions indigenous and traditional knowledge, which is an oversight that should be remedied.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is welcome. Participatory and inclusion of indigenous and traditional knowledge is a key component within each of the three pathways presented.</p>
Introduction	<p>The table of overlap with other sector guides leaves out crucial water issues including erosion, sediment, and contaminant load in nearby waterways, riparian buffers (and the lack thereof) and their connection with waterway health, fertilizer runoff, and associated algal blooms and dead zones. These connections have implications for fisheries and food security as well. The use and potential overuse of water resources for irrigation, especially by larger industrial agricultural operations, must also be a part of considering threats to water access.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Water issues are dealt with in the water sectoral guide.</p>
Introduction	<p><u>As one can see from the UN CFS product on water for food security, the sectoral guidance documents on water and agriculture must have a lot of cross references. This document (http://www.fao.org/3/a-av046e.pdf) is a negotiated and multilaterally agreed policy recommendation based on the report by the High-Level Panel of Experts of the UN CFS, i.e. HLPE report on water. http://www.fao.org/3/a-av045e.pdf. This report also must be used also in developing sectoral guidelines on Ecosystem and Ecosystem Services as well as energy and Health. See related comment #27.</u></p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>
Introduction	<p>Good to list the cross-sectoral issues addressed in the breakout box at the top of page 7</p>	<p>Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association</p>	<p>Thank you for the positive feedback</p>

Introduction	The document uses the term "farmers" and "farm households" or "producers". No mention is made of pastoralists or agro-pastoralists, and the term fishers. Harmonization usage of these terms is critical to provide clarity. Specific mention of the terms pastoralists and agropastoralist in the document will reflect the situation in Africa	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is welcome. A reference to pastoralist has been added in the executive summary. The term farmers covers in this sectoral guide all groups, including pastoralists and agro pastoralists.
Introduction	Scope of the term "agriculture". Agriculture should be conceived in its broadest sense of encompassing crops, livestock, capture fisheries and aquaculture and agroforestry. However, the challenge is agroforestry is usually accounted for under forestry.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received. Agriculture is used in its broadest sense in this guide.
Introduction	We note the usage of the term food waste but in African context the most commonly used term is "post-harvest losses". However, the term "post-harvest losses" has only appeared in the case studies and not in the main text of the document. It may be necessary to reflect "post-harvest losses" in the main text alongside the term food waste	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Thank you for the feedback. Post harvest losses are indeed important and are embedded in the general description of food loss and waste as part of the third paradigm shifting pathway.
Introduction	This should include extension and advisory services to farmers as this remains a critical deficit and without those services the link to providing climate information is not established	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is welcome. Extension services are well embedded across the three pathways. This linkage will be further elaborated going forward.
Introduction	Why is this a footnote, whilst endnotes are used elsewhere in this guide?	GCF Secretariat	Not included
1.1	It would be helpful to point out that, even in the absence of climate change, productivity is hampered by sub-optimal application of fertilizers and poor management of soil, water, pests and disease. As one option for strengthening climate resilience is to increase incomes and savings, addressing these basic deficiencies would yield tremendous benefits	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is welcome. The resilience aspect and opportunity to increase incomes and savings through better farm management is well embedded in all three pathways.
1.1	It would be helpful to characterize agricultural production as a combination of crop cultivation and agro-forestry production, based on plant/tree capital stock because of the differences in investment decisions, financing requirements, and cash flow issues for smallholders to take plants/trees out of production in order to increase future productivity. To reinforce this point, a very recent survey article on the drivers of climate resilient management decisions did not list access to finance as one of the primary drivers/barriers. Most important was access to information and extension services. Acevedo, Maricelis, et al. "A scoping review of adaption of climate-resilient crops by small-scale producers in low- and middle-income countries," Nature Plants, Vol. 6 October 2020, pp. 1231-1241. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41477-020-00783-z	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Agree. Agroforestry is part of both pathway one and three. Pathway one has now been changed to agroecology which also includes agroforestry as does the food systems pathway.
1.1	For consideration: increase of the potential evapotranspiration (ET) & some research about sweet water aquaculture systems in the context of climate change > big lakes disappearing	GIZ	Thank you for the comment. This will be considered in future iterations.
1.1	It is larger than just adaptation challenges	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is welcome. the sentence has been rephrased, and includes amongst others adaptation challenges to highlight it is broader.

1.1	May I suggest including trade increases, which has value chain implications and risks http://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/18679629-67bd-4030-818c-35b206d03f34/	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.1	From my understanding, a guide should give a step by step way of doing something or getting to a desired end. The steps should be clear and progressive such that the reader can evaluate themselves. From reading this guide, it is information from research of what is being done in the agricultural sector.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received however the guide seeks to provide the overall direction of the sector and where paradigm shift can be achieved. This will then translate into project formulation using the guide for direction and inspiration.
1.1	If this section was developed for experts then it's okay, but if for laymen then the language is technical. This is because there is so much reference to research work and technical terms like meta-analyses, herbage growth and other scientific terms.	GCF Secretariat	Please see response above.
1.1	Is this a typo? (The only definitions of "small stock" that I can find on line are all linked to financial markets and stock exchanges.)	GCF Secretariat	Correction made, small livestock.
1.1	There is a glaring omission of the gender dimension, e.g., that women smallholder farmers are disproportionately represented in rainfed agriculture.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. the guide goes beyond rainfed agriculture and across the entire food system. the gender dimension is strongly embedded across the three pathways.
1.1	Definitely keep all of the academic background and rationale along with sources as it supports the importance of finding climate smart solutions	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received
1.1	Heat stress significantly impacts yields and productivity more than rainfall does but, since heat is not a visible hazard like rainfall, not much attention is paid to its contribution in the negative impacts on yields and productivity. This aspect of impact has not been brought out clearly in section 1 of this document. It needs to be revisited.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.1	We would not only focus on what will happen, but also include figures of what has already happened. This chapter gives a sense that climate change is future. Impacts are already felt today and there are figures to show it.	World Food Programme (WFP)	Feedback is well received. The intention of the guide is to show both what is happening at present and in the future to help develop the best responses to such challenges through the three pathways. The specific impacts will be presented at the project/programme description level in the concept notes and funding proposals.

1.1	Will these be taken into account when reviewing GCF proposals under the “needs of the recipient”?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Thank you for the comment. The specific guide to proposal development using the sectoral guides will supported during proposal development and training sessions.
1.1	IPCC, SRCCL 2019	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is welcome. The sentence has been deleted.
1.1	If we are citing research work, then we should add specific references – ideally with a hyperlink or url.	GCF Secretariat	feedback is welcome. the guide has been updated.
1.1	p 9 line 9-11: text suggests price shocks and climate-related disasters are separate, wehn in reality they are intimately connected. Revise	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but will not be included.
1.1	p 9 line 25ff: "the vulnerability of the system is one of three ..." Better to write: climate risk is a function of vulnerability and exposure to climate hazards	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but will note be included.
1.2	Regarding the statement "Globally, countries with the most emissions are mainly those with high livestock producon. ", we suggest specifying that we are talking about emissions from agriculture. countries with higher emissions, are industrial-based countries, in which the sector's share of share agriculture is relatively small.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. the sentence has been deleted.
1.2	Related to the final statement "Across agricultural producon systems, livestock, especially cale, is the largest agricultural emissions source and the sector and its emissions are expected to grow", we suggest including, in BAU scenarios. Justified: the growth of emissions will happen if systems with high energy consumption, low efficiency, low quality of supply and production isolated from an integrated environment are mandatory. It is essential that the document indicates that there are different possible paths (pathways), and that there are concrete paths, which are already being taken by many countries, including Brazil, in which livestock production systems are able to align the increase in productivity and production, with emission control.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received
1.2	Does this impact the guidance provided in any way?	GCF Alternative BM	Thank you for the comment. The current guide will not be able to go into full details on the different systems regarding livestock. Livestock based farming systems are very context specific and will be further explored at the proposal development stage.
1.2	"Farmers and supply chains . . . in producing 30-60% more food by 2050 while still achieving greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets." We suggest to add to this sentence the following: "and staying within planetary limits" or "securing ecosystems & ecosystem services"	UNDP	Feedback is well received. ecosystems has been added to the sentence.

1.2	<p>"Agricultural development and low-emissions development practices provide viable strategies for achieving large-scale mitigation impacts, especially when focused on enhancing agricultural productivity in countries with large land areas and populations and where carbon sequestration can help partially offset emissions."</p> <p>Please clarify the meaning of this statement. There is a lot packed into this point and the sentence could better clarified/unpacked.</p>	UNDP	<p>Feedback is well received. The sentence refers to the numerous opportunities across the three pathways spanning increasing resilience and the adaptive capacity of farming systems to increase low emission production in parallel.</p>
1.2	<p>"This will require intensifying use of existing lands and restoring degraded lands, rather than clearing additional forest."</p> <p>We suggest to add ". . . additional forest, wetlands and other ecosystems" to acknowledge that this entails forests, wetlands and other ecosystems.</p>	UNDP	<p>Feedback is well received. ecosystems has been added to the sentence.</p>
1.2	<p>". . . to more climate-resilient and food secure livelihoods, with greater market integration and climate-resilient value chains."</p> <p>As commented previously, i) is the intent of climate resilient agric to be inclusive of regenerative agriculture, silvo pastoralism, sustainable rangeland and pasture management? If not, then we suggest to add reference to the sustainability of the agro-ecological system as follows: ". . . to more climate-resilient, food secure livelihoods, and environmentally sustainable livelihoods, with greater market integration...."</p>	UNDP	<p>Feedback is well received but will not be included in this round.</p>
1.2	<p>"Production technologies and practices should be financially viable . . ."</p> <p>Is this referring to financially viable at the individual household level? Or state level? Financial viability is to a certain extent driven by current values placed on different modes of agriculture.</p>	UNDP	<p>Feedback is well received. the sentence refers to a general context and fully acknowledge the differences across contexts. the level is more at the landscape / project level.</p>
1.2	<p>"There are . . . that provide other environmental co-benefits addressing, for example . . ."</p> <p>We agree that these are co-benefits as currently defined; however, ground water recharge, sustainable use, freshwater quality/quantity, degradation of soil, and etc., are actually variables that interact with climate change and will/already determine the productivity of agricultural lands. This is the shift in perspective/understanding that is required for adaptation and mitigation to succeed over short-, mid-, and long-term. This is a critical issue that is central to how climate change will play out over this century.</p>	UNDP	<p>Feedback is well received. The long term transformation is crucial in junction with the mentioned variables. These are indeed well embedded in all three pathways and also addressed in other sectoral guides.</p>
1.2	<p>In the Global Context section under 1.2, in the second paragraph it states 'Productivity improvements will outpace emissions increases, suggesting that agricultural development can be compatible with mitigation if additional carbon is not lost from the soil or from high carbon stock ecosystems like forests and peatlands.' This sentence ignores the mitigation potential of many agricultural practices (e.g. agroforestry and regenerative agriculture). The compatibility with mitigation thus not only stems from the outpace of productivity improvements, but the simultaneous mitigation effects that a number of agroecological production systems can have. We thus suggest to add those to the sentence: 'Productivity improvements will outpace emissions increases, suggesting that coupled with the mitigation potential of different agricultural practices (agroforestry, regenerative agriculture, etc.) agricultural development can be compatible with mitigation, but only if additional carbon is not lost from the soil or from high carbon stock ecosystems like forests and peatlands.'</p>	Both ENDS	<p>FEedback is much appreciated. the proposed sentence has been added.</p>
1.2	<p>also include emissions in other food systems elements - e.g. in supply chains (during storage, processing and transportation of agricultural produce)</p>	GIZ	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>

1.2	For consideration: add the following to support the argument that agriculture is responsible for 19% of GHG emissions: 30% of global energy consumption and 70 % of global fresh water use? I would complement the water and energy aspect to the food / agriculture + emissions complex. See also UNFCCC; WE4F & also include emissions in other food systems elements - e.g. in supply chains (during storage, processing and transportation of agricultural produce)	GIZ	Feedback is well received, information will not be included in this round.
1.2	In addition to livestock, other big sources include paddy rice production and mineral fertiliser uses - it would be worthwhile also drawing out the opportunities for emissions reductions in these sectors.	GIZ	Agree, this is very important. There are many well documented opportunities to reduce emissions from paddy production, and these will be presented and developed at the project / programme level once submitted to GCF in concept notes or funding proposal, the same goes for mineral fertilizer. the sectoral guide, seeks to only provide the overall direction but will not be able to go into detail for each intervention at this stage.
1.2	This needs to be formulated more carefully, as the wording of the current text (e.g. 'involving' and 'included ... targets, measures or policies') makes it seem as if NDCs have elaborate plans on agriculture and mitigation. Only 157 NDCs have been submitted (with 12 additional INDCs). Of the 157 NDCs that were submitted, 101 consider agriculture and 11 make it a focus area.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is welcome. the sentence has been rephrased.
1.2	Reference to requiring as a solution for productivity improvements "intensifying use of existing lands" should be contextualized/framed that this has to be done in the context of "de-intensifying the use of petrochemical inputs," such as fertilizers, if lasting emissions reduction is to be achieved. The approach in this paragraph can lead to disastrous results. The land used for intensifying agricultural results could be rendered less fertile and at the end would lose all its capacity to produce food. Looking at alternatives such as agroecology where farmers are working with nature based on the ecological reality of their environment is better in alignment with the ultimate goal of climate resilience.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.2	This issue of "countries with large land areas and populations" needs further elaboration as it is not clear	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed in this round.
1.2	"Productivity improvements will outpace ..." This logic needs better justification and is actually incorrect. What changes is emission intensity so that emission rise is slower	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed in this round.
1.2	This intimates a worrying proposition in relation to indicating that livestock production per se is damaging. In many countries, particularly arid and semi-arid environments such as the Sahel, the Greater Horn of Africa, Central Asia, livestock production, largely through extensive pastoralist systems is the only viable form of agriculture. This guidance must be careful not to demonise all livestock producers as for large populations this is the only viable livelihood.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is welcome. the sentence has been deleted.
1.2	Include social benefits such as gender impacts	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received and the suggestion has been incorporated.

1.2	"Productivity improvements will outpace emissions increases, suggesting that agricultural development can be compatible with mitigation if additional carbon is not lost from the soil or from high carbon stock ecosystems like forests and peatlands." Please provide the source for the first part of this statement.	UNDP	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed in this round.
1.2	Some inconsistency with the figures. Please, check and consider presenting them in a table. Also, explain briefly the main GHGs and their sources.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed in this round.
1.2	Missing references (footnotes 5-6)	gisella.berardi@mef.gov.it	references have been added
1.2	For the statement 'Globally, countries with the most emissions are mainly those with high livestock production', we suggest specifying that this refers to emissions from agriculture. The countries with the highest emissions are countries with an industrial base, in which the percentage of the agricultural sector's contribution is relatively low.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received. The sentence have been deleted in the text.
1.2	For the final statement 'Across agricultural production systems, livestock, especially cattle, is the largest agricultural emissions source and the sector and its emissions are expected to grow', we suggest adding the phrase 'in BAU scenarios'. The justification for this is that emissions will increase if high energy expenditure, low efficiency, low food quality and production that is isolated from an integrated environment were to continue. It is essential that the document indicates that different pathways are possible, and that there are specific pathways already embarked upon by many countries, including Brazil, where livestock production systems can balance increased productivity and production with controlling emissions.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.2	first paragraph: use SRCCL (IPCC, 2019) as the basis for your numbers	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.2	Please change " synergies between mitigation and adaptation that link the two goals" into " synergies between mitigation and adaption actions" in item 1.2 paragraph 3.	Advisor to BM Xia Lyu	suggested change has been made
1.3	The Tropical Forest Alliance 2020 collaboration badly missed the goal of zero percent net deforestation that had been set for 2020. In addition to the focus on carbon in agriculture, it would be useful to mention concern about deforestation as an option to open up additional land for agriculture in the wake of declining agricultural and soil productivity and the devastating implications for carbon sequestration	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is appreciated but will be dealt with further in the forest and land use sector guide
1.3	Are we referring to imperial tons ("tons") or metric tonnes ("tonnes")?	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received. Reference is to tonnes.
1.3	Should be "2"	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received, but not included

1.3	"The Global Commission on Adaptation suggests that we need to reach at least 300 million small-scale agricultural producers by 2030 to achieve these goals." While this sentence seems to recognize that we have to focus on small-scale farmers and creating more small-scale farmers, this prioritization is often overlooked in later sections of the document, in line with our overarching comments.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but will not be added in further detail in this iteration
1.3	GCF remarks on different SDGs relevant to agriculture and food security, but leaves aside SDG 6, especially 6.1 and 6.4 related to access and safe drinking water. Since all SDGs are interconnected, it is important to mention SDG 6 and ensure that agricultural activities can be developed under an integrated water management vision that enhances water governance from a bottom-up and a human rights-based approach. COVID 19 has shown now more than ever that clean and safe water is crucial to reduce the inequalities in health, food, and sanitation. Agricultural practices must avoid water pollution, maladaptation through overreliance on irrigation, reducing the use of pesticides and overexploitation of land. Likewise, some agricultural practices can reduce erosion and enhance water infiltration.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. The water aspects will be dealt with in the separate guide for the water sector.
1.3	<u>A recent CFS-HLPE report outlines the nature and potential contributions of agroecological and other innovative approaches to help transition towards sustainable (including climate resilient) food systems (SFSs) that enhance Food Security and Nutrition while helping meet several of the SDG targets: http://www.fao.org/3/ca5602en/ca5602en.pdf [Policy convergence around this is likely to conclude by the next CFS Plenary. in 2021]</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the scope of the guide.
1.3	Mitigation is stated in the document in terms of absolute emissions reduction but it may be useful to put emphasis on reducing emissions intensity	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.3	See my comment above: the requirements for emission reduction are very steep and do not really square with the need for production increase	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.3	Reaching at least 300 million small scale producers is not enough: they need to change behavior too	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but will be addressed in future iterations.
1.3	Adaptation targets seem to be missing. It is all about mitigation while at the same time, the three paradigm-shifting pathways identified by the GCF seem more adaptation-focused. There seems to be a mismatch between the explanation of the problem and the solutions suggested. We suggest to add a bit of emphasis to adaptation in sub-chapters 1.2 and 1.3	World Food Programme (WFP)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

1.3	Could this be also presented as a table?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
1.4	Could this be expanded to make an investment case that would meet private sector bond market requirements?	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope at this stage.
1.4	It should be noted that the Global Commission on Adaptation estimates are for adaptation net benefits across all sectors - the last sentence seems to be a non-sequitur to the statement above regarding agricultural subsidies	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is well received but will not be included
1.4	"Global agricultural subsidies in 2017 alone were more than US\$ 500 billion." Is this referring to subsidies for conventional agriculture?	UNDP	Feedback is well received but will not be included
1.4	Another useful comparison is the investment mobilised in tackling covid in a very short period of time. the momentum for investment in green recovery may be worth linking to	GIZ	Feedback is well received but will not be included
1.4	Why is this section relevant here? The guideline is supposed to help AEs define projects in the agricultural sector not give a general overview of potential world adaptation/mitigation finance needs in the agricultural sector.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is well received. The guide follows a standard template used across all sectors and to provide the overall direction in the agriculture sector and where GCF can play a key role with its funding.
1.4	This is not a correct characterization of the \$100 billion goal (there is not an intended 50/50 split between mitigation and adaptation)	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. The specific reference to 50 billion has been amended.
1.4	In support of public finance , Ceres2030's new research reveals that donor governments must spend an additional USD 14 billion a year on average until 2030 to end hunger, double the incomes of 545 million small-scale farmers, and limit agricultural emissions in line with the Paris climate agreement. This means roughly doubling the amount of aid given for food security and nutrition each year, and must also be accompanied by an additional USD 19 billion a year from low- and middle-income countries' own budgets.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.4	SAME COMMENT AS FOR THE SECTORAL GUIDANCE ON CITIES, BUILDINGS, AND URBAN INFRASTRUCTURE: While the estimates provided are coming from different sources, we believe that assessing financial needs for specific results areas is not required in this document. Needs are currently assessed in other contexts, e.g. a first overview of methodologies and approaches will be only discussed at the next COP26, whose objective is assessing potential financial needs rather than determining them. Therefore we would like to request a revision of the paragraph accordingly: an estimated quantification of financial requirement within the sectoral guidance for results areas to assess investment priorities for the GCF-1 is not currently included within the mandate.	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

1.4	Agricultural subsidies. There are divergence views about the application of agricultural subsidies. However, subsidies for small-scale farmers in Africa are a necessary evil in order to help them come out of poverty and deal with high costs of inputs and insurance premiums. There is evidence to show that public subsidy is necessary to catalyse participation of private sector insurance companies in offering cover. For example, under the Kenya Agriculture Insurance Programme, the Government offers a 50 percent insurance subsidy for smallholders growing maize and wheat, one of the first large-scale schemes in Africa while in Uganda, the government offers a 70 percent subsidy for smallholder and commercial farmers.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
1.4	"Given the importance of agriculture in developing countries, the cost of adaptation for agriculture alone could be more than \$100 billion per year." As commented previously, we advise to provide the reference for this statement and clarify how this figure was calculated.	UNDP	The reference has been deleted.
1.4	please illustrate the data resource for " The Paris Agreement target of US\$ 50 billion annually across all sectors is insufficient to meet future adaptation." in item 1.4, paragraph 1.	Advisor to BM Xia Lyu	The sentence has been amended and does not refer to 50 billion
2	"systems" is a most common wording used for instance by IPCC	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received but will not be included
2	GCF funding should be used to support alternative agricultural models that help build a healthy, low carbon, resilient and equitable food system – for example, local and urban food systems, landscape approaches, support for strengthening land tenure which has impacts on sustainable land and forest management .	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. the sectoral guide presents the three overarching paradigm shifting pathways.
2.1	What does this mean? Is this good (to be encouraged), bad (to be minimized) or neutral (to be monitored and the consequences managed)?	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed at this stage.
2.1	Doesn't it also include making such diets available? (e.g. ensuring that food is not adulterated)	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is welcome. The focus on diets as part of the pathway will be very context specific and best dealt with at the project level and concrete discussion and review by GCF secretariat at the concept note and funding proposal stage.
2.1	From SRCCL IPCC : Practices that contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation in cropland include increasing soil organic matter, erosion control, improved fertiliser management, improved crop management, for example paddy rice management, and use of varieties and genetic improvements for heat and drought tolerance. For livestock, options include better grazing land management, improved manure management, higher-quality feed, and use of breeds and genetic improvement. Different farming and pastoral systems can achieve reductions in the emissions intensity of livestock products. □ New varieties (genetic improvements) AND use of existing varieties	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

2.1	It seems much clearer to have only one paragraph with the practices that is referred to in the other parts of the document. The seeds, varieties are already in the paragraph and they cannot appear as first proposals, because they are not transformational as such.	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	"Local" refers to a crucial idea that should figure in the key principles and in the executive summary	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is welcome. Local approaches in various contexts is well embedded across all pathways.
2.1	We advise to consider that pathways 1 and 3 could also benefit from considering the elements of agroecology. (http://www.fao.org/3/I9037EN/i9037en.pdf)	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated. Agroecology is embedded in all three pathways and additional references to agroecology have been inserted.
2.1	"Smallholder producers, particularly women, are among the most vulnerable and at-risk." We recommend to add youth- who are specially important in many of the rural vulnerable areas. Indigenous peoples and people with disabilities should also be included, especially when additional support (beyond the usual CC training and support for farmers) is required for these groups.	UNDP	Feedback is appreciated. youth and indigenous people have been added.
2.1	"Reorienting how . . . natural habitats is the direct mechanism to achieve resiliency." Please consider that, in many cases, the pressures on natural habitats are not immediate but part of a global chain of stressors, demands, etc.	UNDP	Feedback is appreciated but will not be addressed at this stage.
2.1	"A range of adaptation interventions can be promoted . . . that include: improved and climate-resilient crop and livestock varieties; innovative adaptation practices and technologies . . ." We advise to acknowledge here that these should not be detrimental to soil health and the ecosystem that supports it. Also, is improved/climate resilient agricultural practices captured under innovative adaptation practices? We advise to consider shifting the focus to climate resilient crops, livestock, and adoption of a landscape approach to consider also upstream - downstream linkages in food production.	UNDP	Feedback is well received. The focus of the pathway is on agroecology, this has been updated accordingly and the linkages to soil health and ecosystems are well embedded.
2.1	"This can be accomplished through crop rotations, intercropping and growing different crops or varieties in different parts of a farm." We advise to consider adding the following text on silvopastoralism: "Silvopastoralism is the symbiotic system that integrates livestock and agriculture in a way that improves resilience to both animals and trees and forage, by providing heat protection (shade), wind protection and nutrient-rich diets for cows and other livestock. This practice also sequesters carbon in topsoil biomass and soil below. This system also supports biodiversity and other ecosystem services (water retention and micro-climate)."	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

2.1	<p>"Promising actions include technologies such as solar irrigation and micro-pumps."</p> <p>We advise to consider that restoration of degraded/destroyed and conservation of existing natural ecosystems to restore critical ecosystem services - water absorption, storage, recharge, filtration - pollination, and pest control should also be included. Paradigm shift will emerge if we are able to restore the Earth's ability to maintain life support systems through how we transform and adapt our agricultural production systems.</p> <p>This is critical; promising actions should not be limited to "technologies" - these technologies are absolutely needed, but in combination with the suggestions above.</p>	UNDP	The comment is appreciated. restoration of degraded lands and ecosystems is well embedded in the sectoral guide, and will be more defined in the forests and land use and ecosystems guides.
2.1	<p>"Designing and deploying multi-channel, multi-directional delivery mechanisms can ensure that all clients have many opportunities to receive information and services without adding to their work burden."</p> <p>Please clarify what kind of information this is referring to. Is it climate change related information?</p>	UNDP	Feedback is well received. the sentence refers to climate information, early warning systems, land use data to help communities adapt livelihoods and farming practices.
2.1	<p>"The most effective delivery mechanisms tend to be those that facilitate personal relationships and multi-way communication and low or no cost, including in-person extension, cooperatives, community representatives, knowledge exchange platforms, and social mobile apps."</p> <p>We recommend to acknowledge that when utilizing in-person extension mechanisms, the people delivering the information need to be trained and equipped with long-term capacity building plans (instead of the limited short term training workshops that are not available for all extension workers). These extension workers need the technical knowledge and tools to be able to properly deliver information, support the monitoring of resilient ag practices and provide technical advice at the farm level. The current reality is that the extension officers are accustomed to conventional ag practices but not CC-informed ag practices and actions- so without proper (long term) capacity building and education, the delivery mechanisms will not be effective beyond the short term. It is important to acknowledge this, and the required costs and designs for this approach in ag/food programming.</p>	UNDP	The feedback is well received. the sectoral guides outlines the general use of extension services and fully acknowledges the need for trained and skilled extension workers.
2.1	<p>"Digital technology investments can reduce transaction costs, supporting transparency and risk management, and speeding and smoothing cash flows."</p> <p>In our experience, there is a tendency to view these interventions as non-CC related and therefore are requested by GCF to be co-financed. However, if GCF acknowledges the importance of digital technical as an transformative tool for climate informed financial and market services, then is it correct to understand that GCF will also be investing in these types of activities? Guidance on this matter would be helpful.</p>	UNDP	Feedback is well received. The digital solutions should be promoted on a case by case scenario where they appear to be the best and most innovative solutions. Promoting solutions looking at tools for climate informed financial and market services would be innovative and falls within the paradigm shifting pathways.
2.1	<p>"Improving access to innovative technologies, including digital agriculture and service bundling, such as that offered by iShamba, can increase . . ."</p> <p>As stated above, it will be difficult to make the case that these mechanisms can support farmers resilience unless and only if climate change data and scenarios and the impacts on local farming sector are analyzed and synthesized in a way that is user friendly and easy to understand.</p> <p>Also, it would be useful for other diverse examples of digital platforms to be provided, considering the diverse scope of ag/food programming.</p>	UNDP	Feedback is well received. response as above.
2.1	<p>"This example shows the potential for integrated programs working at farm and landscape scales to be transformational."</p> <p>Similar to the above comment, more examples of the synergistic and transformational approaches would be useful as guidance.</p>	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. Further examples and more context specific cases will be developed at the project and programme level.

2.1	"Reconfiguring food systems" We advise for this section to elaborate on perverse incentives, policies, marketing, pricing and health campaigns in the context of this pathway, even though they are discussed as cross-cutting issues.	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	"Climate-resilient food systems enable consistency and adaptive capacity in mobilizing, transporting, processing, storing and distributing agricultural products, fostering national food security and supporting domestic and international agricultural businesses." We recommend to consider that climate resilient food system also need to enable environmental sustainability, given the interlinkages and feedback loops discussed previously.	UNDP	Feedback is well received. the food systems promoted will indeed also need to enable environmental sustainability, this will be fully embedded in the 3rd pathway.
2.1	"These should include coordinated policies, capacity building, . . ." The subsidies should be geared towards supporting climate resilient regenerative agric production, restoration, agro-forestry. Please consider including the following: "including a deep assessment and changes in government-issued subsidies to conventional agriculture which leads to environmental degradation, deforestation, and increased vulnerability to climate change, capacity building and increased awareness at the government, society and farmer level..."	UNDP	Feedback is well received. an addition of ...including assessments of ongoing subsidies have been added.
2.1	The guidance provides a useful list of adaptations in agriculture (Pathway 1 discussion) but adaptive capacity can be increased through numerous development measures related to livelihoods, alternative incomes, non-crop related social networks, education, health, etc. suggesting that a project could be focused on livelihoods and less narrowly on climate resilient crop production. It is important to recognize that there is considerably more resources available for development than for adaptation and integrated projects might pull in more domestic public resources if more broadly focused.	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is well received. Pathway one has changed to agroecology which looks at the broader ecosystem level and access to services.
2.1	Excellent discussion of extension delivery and biases against important producer groups in Pathway 2. It is important to encourage countries to characterize organizational capacity to provide extension and information services - will government extension services provide support beyond the life of the GCF project? Can cooperatives be supported with capacity building training to provide locally-based extension services on a more sustainable basis? locally based	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is well received. in principle there is scope for this type of model and support to cooperatives.
2.1	Under Pathway 1: Promoting Resilient Agriculture, first paragraph, same issue as in comment number 2	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received. Pathway one has changed to resilient agroecology
2.1	Under Pathway 1: Promoting Resilient Agriculture, first paragraph, it states 'Priorities for resilient agriculture should directly respond to key regional climate hazards and the specific risks they pose to agricultural production within that context. We suggest to add: should directly respond to smallscale farmers' needs and to key regional climate hazards...	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received. within the farming landscapes has been added. the reason for the regional level, is to be able to measure and report on impact through data. but the focus is indeed on the smallscale farmers within these landscapes
2.1	Under Pathway 1: Promoting Resilient Agriculture, second paragraph, it states 'innovative adaptation practices and technologies' as one of the adaptation interventions, without further specifying what those adaptation practices are supposed to look like. We suggest to mention examples and include references to proven practices: A number of different relevant agroecological practices relevant in that regard are showcased here: (https://www.bothends.org/en/Whats-new/Publicaties/Unlocking-Public-Finance-for-Agroecology-Catalysing-the-potential-of-agriculture-in-achieving-the-Sustainable-Development-Goals/) and here (on Kenya and Senegal): (http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CB0438EN/).	Both ENDS	Agro ecology is well embedded across the three pathways. additional references to agro ecology have been added.

2.1	Under Pathway 1: Promoting Resilient Agriculture, third paragraph, it states 'Improved seeds, crop varieties, and breeds that address specific climate risks are key to adapt to climate change.' Here it is unsure to which extent those improved seeds, crop varieties, and breeds take the local socio-cultural and ecological context into consideration. We therefore suggest to add the following: 'Improved seeds, crop varieties, and breeds that are co-developed and bred in a participatory way with local producers to address specific climate risks are key to adapt to climate change'.	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Under Pathway 1: Promoting Resilient Agriculture, fourth paragraph, it states 'Promising actions include technologies such as solar irrigation and micro-pumps.' We suggest to add cover crops and tree integration as effective low-cost practices: 'Promising actions include technologies such as solar irrigation and micro-pumps and an ecological integration of woody species and cover crops.'	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received and the sentence has been updated.
2.1	<u>Under pathway 1: After paragraph 2, please add: Secure land tenure rights are key to a resilient agriculture as they contribute to long-term commitment for farmers to manage land sustainably. As women grow almost 70 percent of food in the African continent, secure land tenure rights for women advance resilient agriculture and strengthens the position of women. The Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT) provide guidance on how land tenure rights can be respected and strengthened: http://www.fao.org/docrep/016/i2801e/i2801e.pdf. Acknowledging and following the VGGT would therefore be a good step for GCF</u>	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Under Pathway 3: Reconfiguring food systems, first paragraph, same issue as in comment number 7	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed at this stage.
2.1	Under Pathway 3: Reconfiguring food systems, second paragraph, it states 'Large agri-food actors are increasingly held socially responsible for the widespread impacts of the supply and value chains they drive; the resulting initiatives often offer important co-benefits for small-scale producers.' Whilst we agree that more and more attention is placed on the social responsibility of large agri-food actors, we think that even more attention is needed to drive them towards sustainable action. Rather than framing it passively, we therefore suggest the following: 'Large agri-food actors should be further held socially responsible for the widespread impacts of the supply and value chains they drive; with consequential initiatives targeted at offering effective co-benefits for small-scale producers.' The previously mentioned support for international agricultural businesses (see point 7 and 15) should also be made conditional to the social responsibility mentioned under this point.	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed at this stage.
2.1	Under Pathway 3: Reconfiguring food systems, third paragraph, it states 'incentivize climate resilient and low emissions suites of interventions', without providing an example of what those interventions are supposed to look like. We suggest to mention the following FAO report on 'The potential of agroecology to build climate-resilient livelihoods and food systems' as a strong source of reference: (http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CB0438EN/)	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Under Pathway 3: Reconfiguring food systems, same paragraph, it also states 'There is an important role for both smaller agri-food actors, such as local cooperatives, and industry platforms and farmer organizations like the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, the International Fertilizer Association, World Farmers' Organization, along with other global, regional, national and local organizations.' We don't consider those platforms to be strong examples and thus suggest to replace them with legitimate, transparent and democratically chosen platforms like the UN Committee on World Food Security (CFS) in general, and its Civil Society and Indigenous Peoples' Mechanism (CSM) in particular. Another important one is the International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty (IPC), representing more than 6000 organizations and 300 millions of small-scale food producers.	Both ENDS	FEedback is welcome. CFS has been added to the sentence and representing stakeholders at the end of the sentence. The list mentioned here is not exclusive rather only an example.

2.1	General comment: we are talking a lot about "resilience" and in the context of climate change we probably refer to "Climate resilience". Nevertheless, especially in the food and agriculture sector we need a broader understanding of resilience as a principle of sustainable development. We should avoid replacing the concept of sustainability with the concept of resilience. The future prevailing development paradigm will determine whether SDGs and climate goals can be achieved. This is above all a question of how mankind deals with nature and natural resources.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Not all of the listed practices happen on farm, but also have to happen at landscape level. How is this considered? How these have to be 'commercially viable' or how incentives can be provided to support broader societal goal? Please take into consideration the different levels of intervention and action, i.e. farm level, landscape or (agro-)ecosystem level and finally about food system levels. It is still not clear, how the "three pathways" will address these levels and will be operationalized.	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated. the three pathways are interlinked and will promote actions at the farm, landscape and larger biome level.
2.1	These technologies are useful, but their usefulness is not sector specific. Question: If we only look at the ag.-sector there is still the question of, who is responsible for this climate services and how close the so called "last mile" to reach the farmers (adoption rate)?	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Most the activities in this section as well as above (grazing land and paddy rice, management, etc) are in the fuzzy area between CC and development: while those are a part of CC strategies and plans for a paradigm shift in the sector, how is GCF assessing its financial contribution to those activities, will GCF cover the full cost of those activities ?	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated. the suggested activities in a given project will need to be assessed on a case by case basis.
2.1	is a broad group of actors ranging from private to public providers and infomediaries - it might be good to unpack this a bit more and also articulate the role of each within this	GIZ	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
2.1	The regional level might also be worth elaborating upon, since regional trade between countries plays an important role in food security, but also in ensuring resilient food systems	GIZ	The feedback is appreciated. the sectoral guide promotes food security across all levels including regional level and this is embedded across the three pathways.
2.1	and processed - value addition offers a huge opportunity as well	GIZ	Feedback is welcome. Food processing is well embedded in pathway 3 including the value addition it brings.
2.1	+ cooling	GIZ	Feedback is well received. cooling is important for pathway 3 and is embedded in the overall objective. cooling will be dealt with further in the energy sector guide.
2.1	Does non-farm diversification fit into this, or is diversification limited to agriculture?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback appreciated. non farm has been added. Non farm-diversification is included, for example job creation.

2.1	In the Promoting Resilient Agriculture pathway section, describe how this pathway builds on the Climate-Smart Agriculture approach. --Climate-smart agriculture (CSA) is a well-established and well-understood approach and is referenced in the country examples. Referencing CSA in this section and positioning its role in the resilient agriculture pathway would strengthen this guidance as users would be able relate the Promoting Resilient Agriculture pathway to this established approach.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is welcome. CSA is embedded in pathway 1 and 3 and pathway 1 contains the same milestones that CSA is built upon. Pathway one has now been updated to focus on resilient agroecology
2.1	The key role that women, youth and other marginalized groups play in promoting resilient agricultural is well referenced in other parts of the document but missing in this pathway which rather frames them a vulnerable but not agents of change. This pathway needs to better balance the focus on technological approaches to resilient agriculture with sufficient attention how addressing issues of gender and inequality is critical to agriculture productivity and food and nutrition security. Inequality in the world's agricultural systems is suppressing food production and food security; it is estimated that if women had access to the same agricultural resources as men, women's yields would increase by 20–30 percent (FAO 2011. The State of Food and Agriculture, Women in agriculture: closing the gender gap for development. www.fao.org/docrep/013/i2050e/i2050e.pdf).	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. Gender and inequality are all strongly embedded in all pathways. Specific approaches and technology with a given context should be presented during project and programme development.
2.1	May want to include other priority characteristics such as accessible, inclusive, culturally appropriate etc.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received. the suggestion has been added to the sentence.
2.1	Would be great to also mention the newer Participatory Climate Information Services Systems Development methodology, which was developed as part of the Learning Agenda in SSA. It goes beyond community-level approaches to take a holistic view of improving the overall effectiveness of the climate services system by bringing together key stakeholders from across the CS system, strengthening the capacity of local actors at all levels to contribute meaningfully to multistakeholder discussions on CS, and facilitating dialogue and consensus-building for action, including locally-driven improvements. See these references: https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2020_USAID_Learning-Agenda_Spotlight%20Series-Learning-Agenda-on-Climate-Services.pdf https://www.climatelinks.org/resources/PCISSD-guide	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	It will be also useful with a some examples of practices and technologies that are not sustainable and that will not be funded by the GCF.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The specific details of such will be dealt with at the review stage of concept notes and funding proposals.
2.1	Is there merit in indicating that proposals benefit from stimulating and demonstrating such co-benefits?	GCF Alternative BM	Feedback is welcome. the sentence refers to the co-benefits that every project has and can further promote
2.1	More language on the demand-side could be beneficial, to demonstrate how this is part of the picture for proposals to take into account.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The specific details of such will be dealt with at the review stage of concept notes and funding proposals.
2.1	Some examples to explain this statement could be useful .	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The specific details of such will be dealt with at the review stage of concept notes and funding proposals.

2.1	The agricultural sector is also key for mitigation, this is not considered sufficiently here. Pathway 1 should be on climate smart agriculture (mitigation and adaptation); another pathway could otherwise be added that looks solely into the mitigation benefits of agriculture.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated. the sector guide is cross cutting. each pathway contains both mitigation and adaptation actions that are interlinked across the three pathways. Further work will be developed to provide more examples and guidance across the pathways.
2.1	Why is the focus only on adaptation here? This should be a clear target for climate smart agriculture that integrates resilience and mitigation at the same time with both being prioritized	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated. the sector guide is cross cutting. each pathway contains both mitigation and adaptation actions that are interlinked across the three pathways. Further work will be developed to provide more examples and guidance across the pathways.
2.1	All of these are mitigation relevant. Hence the whole section should not only focus on adaptation but clearly have climate smart practices for adaptation and mitigation in its core focus	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated. the sector guide is cross cutting. each pathway contains both mitigation and adaptation actions that are interlinked across the three pathways. Further work will be developed to provide more examples and guidance across the pathways.
2.1	Especially given this potential and target, mitigation should be more prominently addressed in this pathway.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	See comment in the executive summary. The benefits of certain resilience and mitigation measures for this risk service should be integrated	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	It is important to consider flood prone ag systems (i.e. Mississippi which can offer lessons to other deltas); drought prone ag systems; and land use planning in watersheds/catchments with working landscapes that include farming systems which need to respond to climate change threats. In water scarce (drought prone) regions, agricultural development will require incentivizing water management and assessing tradeoffs particularly on water use and water allocation for nature and people. Please see:	The Nature Conservancy	Feedback is well received. Water related issues will be targeted by the water sector guide.
2.1	1. US- Mississippi River Basin: Flood Prioritization Tool https://www.nature.org/en-us/what-we-do/our-priorities/protect-water-and-land/land-and-water-stories/new-tool-protect-floodplains-mississippi-river-basin/	The Nature Conservancy	Feedback is well received. Water related issues will be targeted by the water sector guide.
2.1	2. Kenya: growth of the agriculture sector in the Upper Tana watershed area has resulted in an increase in soil erosion and sedimentation. The same watershed supplies nearly 95% of water supply to city of Nairobi. Building platforms such as the Upper Tana Nairobi Water Fund that support small holder farmers in agricultural management practices aims to improve soil erosion and sedimentation. (IFAD is the lead implementing agency for this GEF-funded program in which TNC participates).	The Nature Conservancy	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.

2.1	3. Healthy Agricultural Systems in Central America – in countries such as Guatemala, the protection of spring water systems supports coffee farmers. https://www.resilientcentralamerica.org/en/water-and-agriculture-funds-were-created-as-innovative-mechanisms-for-the-conservation-of-springs-and-the-promotion-of-sustainable-agriculture-in-the-cerro-cacahuatique-region/	The Nature Conservancy	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.
2.1	4. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2468312419300203	The Nature Conservancy	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.
2.1	These plans should lead to the use of sustainable practices, such as precision agriculture, organic farming, agro-ecology, agro-forestry and stricter animal welfare standards.	Board Member	Agree, this is the ideal scenario and each pathway stimulates this direction.
2.1	While it is important to improve seeds and crop varieties, this should not be done at the expense of biodiversity and it should follow the principles of organic farming to the highest extent possible. GCF projects will need to reflect an increased level of ambition to reduce significantly the use and risk of chemical pesticides, as well as the use of fertilisers and antibiotics (see in this regard the principles laid out under the EU “Farm to Fork” strategy).	Board Member	Agree. This is crucial and the sector guide wishes to promote this very strongly. Farm to fork is well embedded in the last pathway.
2.1	It would be appropriate to include references to agro-ecological techniques, as those defined by FAO. Such techniques demonstrate the growing integration and interconnection between living beings (plants, animals, humans) and the environmental and social context. Moreover, they could be crucial to develop a sustainable and equitable food system, based on bottom-up and territorial processes critical to provide contextualized solutions for local problems.	Board Member	FEedback is well noted. Agro ecology is well embedded in all three pathways, in particular pathway 1. Further references to agro ecology have been inserted.
2.1	While we support in principle the emphasis on climate-informed digital agricultural advisory services, please provide further clarifications on the following: a) how the required research results would be disclosed and transferred to the field; b) which are the potential barriers for smallholder farming communities in LDCs, SIDS and generally the most vulnerable and more traditional communities; c) how it could be adapted to traditional farming practices including at the communities; d) which is the level of resources required and how they will be assessed in terms of cost-benefit analysis given the limited resources available under the GCF; e) whether the support level of indigenous needed from private/public co-financing is envisaged to ensure sustainability of GCF investments.	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Is there a threshold of resiliency being aimed for, i.e., resilient to a 1 in 500 event, 1 in 1000 event? How are we defining resiliency here and over what time frame?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated. the folowing has been added to the sentence ..within given context. the resiliency used here is at the general level, how it will be achieved within each context goes beyond the scope of the guide but will be saved for later iterations
2.1	This may be the case but diversification to reach resilient systems may involve yield or income sacrifice. GCF could potentially look at transition, phasing in periods in proposals or other options to mitigate these risks?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is very welcome. the issue of transition is well noted and is embedded in the three pathways.
2.1	Could also be worth managing the microclimate for example through shade and/or windbreaks to reduce Evapotranspiration	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is welcome and the sentence has been updated with the suggestion.

2.1	<p>The text refers at multiple times to “improved seed,” without defining it and here speaks of “improved seeds, crop varieties, and breeds that address specific climate risks are key to adapt to climate change” as a solution, which implicitly promotes and opens the path for GMOs (which, as noted in the overarching comments, are not formally mentioned) including genetically modified trees. It must be made clear that GCF financing is NOT supporting the development and introduction of GMOs into farming and that there will be no investment and financial support to grow GMO crops as that is not needed. In this framing, the document overlooks the risks and challenges of genetically modified seeds, including their ban in certain GCF countries, which must be addressed by any GCF project that proposes using these “improved seeds” or GMOs. Instead, this guidance seems to suggest that AEs have implicit endorsement for this controversial and contested, particularly by many local communities, pathway for improved output. This is problematic and this document cannot implicitly promote GMOs as a solution to climate change and hunger.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated. the improved seeds do not refer to GMOs</p>
2.1	<p>Reference to “expanding access to appropriate financial mechanism” should clarify that “gender-responsive access to appropriate financial mechanisms” is needed given the gender-disparity/gender discrimination in access to finance for agriculture and food security measures</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.</p>
2.1	<p>Pathway 1 must recognize and acknowledge that the private sector includes small scale producers themselves, including women, who collectively are responsible for large investments in the agriculture sector in developing countries and are a source of innovation that can have impact at scale. Models and approaches to catalyzing climate innovation should recognize low-external input technologies, diversification and mixed agriculture systems as key strategies to adaptation. Agro-ecology represents a range of approaches that can support adaptation.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received. All three pathways recognize this. private sector in the guide includes every level from small scale producers to large scale corporates.</p>
2.1	<p>The use of “where possible and appropriate” lacks accountability and is very compromising.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received. the where possible and appropriate has been deleted</p>

2.1	Include indigenous peoples in “Smallholder producers, particularly women, are among the most vulnerable and at-risk. “	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. Indigenous peoples have been added.
2.1	Higher temperatures may also lead to more incidence of forest fires. This section should look at how to improve nature fire breaks, including planting green belts, improving community and national policies and enabling communities to be able to implement these at the most local level. This is also connected to the still to be developed land and forests sector guidance.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. forest fires will be dealt with in the forest and land use sector guide.
2.1	The ability of digital agriculture to overcome market power and anti-competitive agribusiness practices through real time price discovery is vastly overstated. However, the ability of cellphone technology to assist farmers in detecting and treating plant pathogens and animal diseases is a very important development that effectively extends underfunded extension services.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. Technology in a broad sense including cellphone tech is fully embedded in the guide
2.1	Digital technology investments for climate services for the agricultural sector, while good, may highlight the already existing digital divide especially for indigenous peoples who do not have necessary infrastructure and who live in remote areas that are not easily reached by both internet and radio or telephone companies. It is therefore imperative not just to designing and deploying multi-channel, multi-directional and ensuring delivery mechanisms but also make sure that these are culturally appropriate and responsive to ensure that all clients (including women and indigenous peoples) have many opportunities to receive information and services without adding to their work burden.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	See response above

2.1	In the promotion of the digitalization of agriculture, the risks to data sovereignty must be acknowledged. Big tech sees agriculture as the new El Dorado for their technologies, harkening back to the first Green Revolution and chemical products. The question of data sovereignty and open-source apps should be addressed.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.
2.1	There is bias in the paper that largely equates "social safety net support," which is an important consideration for food security/food sovereignty considerations, with insurance provision. Insurance is but one tool of a wider approach of social safety net provision, including reinforcing and expanding public options, such as food banks, food stockpiles, etc. Insurance approaches are often not adequate, as there are issues of affordability, accessibility for the poorest and coverage, and the scale of payouts related to needs.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is welcome. The weather based insurance is only one example and it is well acknowledged that more support is needed on various sides.
2.1	Weather index insurance can be a useful risk management tool for smallholders if the underlying index is reliable and indemnification for crop loss is prompt and without bureaucratic expense. But the first sentence introducing the insurance product surely overstates the economic impact of index insurance by portraying it as the safeguard against having to sacrifice long term benefits (school fees for education) vs. immediate food purchases.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is welcome. The weather based insurance is only one example and it is well acknowledged that more support is needed on various sides.
2.1	<u>The section on insurance fails to reflect that many market insurance approaches are not adapted to the needs of the poorest people and are not affordable to them or do not come with enough work to build financial literacy e.g. The GCF should ensure, when supporting insurance approaches, to give clear attention to pro-poor approaches. The InsuResilience Global Partnership Pro poor principles should be used as a reference. https://www.insuresilience.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/insuresilience_propoor_190529-2.pdf</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.

2.1	<p>Further on the issue of insurance, the GCF may also consider whether it can support sovereign risk mechanisms like African Risk Capacity (incl. Through premium support), as for example the contingency plans in case of payouts of some countries gives strong attention to support food-vulnerable groups in case of extreme weather events. However, in general, payouts are often too small and time-delayed, and it should be carefully analyzed if for example such insurance schemes are indeed better than direct investment of the equivalent premium amount into local support systems in terms of equitable outcomes and direct community benefits. See for example https://actionaid.org/sites/default/files/the_wrong_model_for_resilience_final_230517.pdf</p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	<p>Reducing food loss and waste is a key priority to ensure food security and maintain a balanced production to meet increasing food demand in light of impacts of climate change on food productivity, thus helping to reduce GHG emissions. Food losses and waste should be tackled by a) ensuring improvement of storage and distribution including through sustainable cold chains; b) applying research, innovative policies and management solutions that can address the causes and assess quantities and streams of food losses (industrial transformation, over-production, distribution, early commercialization, etc.). Reduction of packaging and waste is also important in the context of the role of food loss and waste reduction in a circular economy. Communication to raise awareness is also key in this respect.</p>	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	<p>As far as the third paradigm-shift pathway is concerned (Reconfiguring Food Systems), the document does not consider "short supply chains". As the pandemic has shown, they are strategic in times of crisis and they are important to limit production costs and support the local economy as well as to reduce GHG emissions.</p>	Board Member	Feedback is well received. Short supply chains are well embedded in the 3rd pathway. Value chains refer to all type of value chains, including short supply chain.
2.1	<p><u>If this guidance is going to list global organisations like WFO that engage in multilateral processes, this part of the second to last line in para 3 under, Pathway 3: "organizations like the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, the International Fertilizer Association, World Farmers' Organization, along with other global, regional, national and local organizations." should be rephrased to read, "organizations like the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, the International Fertilizer Association, World Farmers' Organization, along with other global, regional, national and local organizations such as national level food sovereignty networks and national level coalitions of farmers networks, both in developing and developed countries as well as global networks such as International Planning Committee for Food Sovereignty: http://www.foodsovereignty.org/ and International Union of Food www.iuf.org."</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been updated and now include a reference to CFS and to accomodate other comments as well, a final wording on representing stakeholders has been added. The list provided is not an exclusive list, but merely an example.
2.1	<p>The opening sentence with reference to "Ensuring global food security" is startling and off the mark. The discourse here should not be how GCF funding supports "global food security" via exports of food to developed countries, but focus on how to ensure national and especially local food security and sovereignty needs are fulfilled. Of note, "local food security" is not mentioned once in this section. As has been stated, reconfiguring food systems needs to be grounded in human rights and acknowledge the right to food, with all the issues related to availability, affordability, and guaranteed access that implies (including for rural smallholders and urban populations).</p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. Global does not refer to only working at the global level through export of food but focuses on working at all levels from local to global. the sentence has been modified and now
2.1	<p>Should we elaborate this point to include youth in farming and the role of digital tech and data in food systems?</p>	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. youth and tech and data has been added to the sentence.

2.1	Is this the right place to talk about land governance and tenure? See recent land inequality report stating 1% of farms control 70% of global farmland	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	How does this align to the Just Rural Transition work and points of action within that? Is it worth highlighting which pillars of JRT the GCF aims to contribute to?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Evaluate the possibility of proposing the implementation of agricultural continuity plan to manage the risk of interruption of agricultural production, in order to integrate the three paradigm-shifting pathways. This will involve definition of roles of public and private sectors followed by training of all. At the end, a proper certification system would be created for locations capable of activating their respective continuity plans in a timely manner.	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the guide.
2.1	Focus area “resilient agriculture” – according to its definition this concept is equivalent of climate smart agriculture (“agriculture that sustainably increases productivity, enhances resilience (adaptation), reduces/removes GHGs (mitigation) where possible, and enhances achievement of national food security and development goals” as FAO defines). Is this right?	Asian Development Bank	Feedback is well received. yes the 1st pathway encompasses the same principles as CSA and has now been updated to 'resilient agroecology'
2.1	Climate risk management tools. The document amplifies more about insurance and less on other potential climate risk management tools. It is important that a suite of climate risk management tools are discussed to provide an opportunity for countries to choose from	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received. climate risk management tools are embedded in the 2nd pathway.
2.1	Climate information. The document is strong on use of climate information but silent on climate information co-generation and downscaling and associated institutional and technical capacities. The document should be strengthened on these aspects. Some reflections on the capacity of national hydrological and meteorological services (NHMS).	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received. The downscaling and capacity building are a key part of the second pathway.
2.1	Contingency planning goes hand in hand with early warning systems (EWSs) but that is not covered in this section.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. EWS are dealt with in the sectoral guide for climate information and early warning systems.
2.1	The document highlights three pathways (promoting resilient agriculture, facilitating climate informed advisory and risk management services and reconfiguring food systems) for transformation of the agriculture sector. In the case of Africa under the continental CAADP framework, countries have adopted value chain approach. A value chain approach would combine Pathway 1 and Pathway 3 with Pathway 2 (climate information and climate risk management tools) as enabler. In this regard, the three pathways outlined in the document are misleading and may need recasting.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is welcome. The three pathways are all interlinked and should be promoted in parallel.
2.1	Several best examples (such as shamba shape, iShamba, PICSA, mobile money transfer are given in the document and would have expected a Box highlighting what makes those best examples that could be reflected. It would be good if the positive attributes or the success lessons from that example is included in the document in a “Box” format to enable readers and users get a preview of why they are cited. In Africa, it would be useful to identify some success stories from North Africa to add to the case studies captured. There is none from North Africa in the document.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	PSP 1 “Reconfiguring food systems” is of particular interest to EBRD, as it may support some of the new initiatives EBRD is trying to develop with large agribusiness clients (commodity trader, retailers) on the topics of supply chain transparency on climate change and environmental impact, but also supporting the development of new / more sustainable value chains (organic productions, short local supply chains, inputs for meat/dairy alternatives, inputs for bio-economy etc.). It therefore equally presents opportunities to develop innovative green supply chain finance products for corporates in the food sector, from primary to retail.	Climate Finance Associate, E2C2, EBRD	Feedback is well received. The food systems pathway offers a very wide approach to paradigm shift and seeks to focus on farm to fork aspects.

2.1	We would stress the fact that insurance needs to be part of an integrated package of risk management mechanisms. It works well when coupled with other interventions.	World Food Programme (WFP)	Feedback is well received. Insurance is embedded in the three pathways.
2.1	When adopted at scale these can deplete groundwater by removing pricing. Maybe the document could point to the need for coordination mechanisms on water management at watershed level.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. water management at watershed level has been added to the sentence.
2.1	In the Pathway 1 discussion, is there empirical evidence that indicates that male-led smallholder farmers are significant;y better off than female-led farms? Or are all smallholder farmers disadvantaged and female-led farms more so?	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is well received
2.1	Women comprise 43 percent of the agricultural labour force: http://www.fao.org/publications/sofa/2010-11/en/	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received
2.1	Reference missing	GCF BM Advisor	A footnote reference has been added
2.1	References or examples of tools and databases (maybe in boxes or even footnotes) could be helpful for those trying to use the guidelines	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Rephrase, "Water and soil moisture management is critical because most agriculture in developing countries is rainfed," with "Water and soil moisture management, including through increasing the water retention capacity of soil, is critical because most agriculture in developing countries is rainfed, and this calls for a shift to use of organic manures and other agroecological practices especially where soil is poor."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	Reference to "expanding access to appropriate financial mechanism" should clarify that "gender-responsive access to appropriate financial mechanisms" is needed given the gender-disparity/gender discrimination in access to finance for agriculture and food security measures	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.

2.1	Add to the last sentence “and supporting/strengthening/scaling up existing practices, including of indigenous peoples that are proven to be effective, efficient and environmentally sustainable.”	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	Rephrase “These provide opportunities for projects to engage with company supply chains” to read: "These provide opportunities for projects to engage with company supply chains, helping ensure that the rights of food producers and workers, especially women are protected as they initiate climate adapting and mitigating actions."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	pg 14 in 2.1 "expanding access to appropriate financial mechanisms that support the uptake and scaling..." perhaps add a 'See section/ case studies for examples of some financial mechanisms put into practice'		Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	pg 15 at the top - the statistic "women (who compose 43% of developing country farmers), youth, etc" Perhaps consider making a breakout box somewhere in the document about women statistics all together leading with this one, as it highlights the importance of creating gender focused solutions		Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	Pg 15 Creating new insurance products will be crucial. Propose to highlight how private sector can assist here in this development. Perhaps a breakout box specifically on insurance. You have the details here but breakout boxes allow for the readers eye to gravitate to specific topics and reemphasise your messages		Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	We suggest to add "processed" in the list.		Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.1	add: ", but also using local varieties"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. Local varieties has been added to the sentence.
2.1	add "using agroecological perspectives"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. Agroecology has been added as an example.
2.1	add "or locally developed"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. locally developed has been added
2.1	add "compost making,"	Advisor to BM Lars Roth	Feedback is well received. Compost making has been added.
2.1	Could this be split into two important paragraphs. One on water management (both above ground, in soil, and groundwater), and one on soil management (soil health, organic matter, carbon, biodiversity).	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.1	Please change “Agriculture is central to food security, livelihoods and economic development, especially in low-income countries” to “ Agriculture is central to food security, livelihoods and economic development, especially in developing countries” (first sentence of Introduction chapter) .	Advisor to BM Xia Lyu	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been reviewed and now reads across the world instead.

2.2	"Land tenure" is a prominent idea and IPCC SRCCL also highlights its importance ("Insecure land tenure affects the ability of people, communities and organisations to make changes to land that can advance adaptation and mitigation"). It should also figure in key principles in the executive summary)	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is welcome. Lack of secure land tenure has been added to the executive summary as one of the general barriers.
2.2	For consideration: the term Climate Smart Agriculture has been strongly criticized by Board members and requested to be removed from a specific FP. Is it a term not acceptable and which definition is expected to be used?	GIZ	Feedback is well received. Climate smart agriculture includes many interventions that are also promoted by the 1st pathway on climate resilient agriculture.
2.2	". . . negotiating power, and increase access to resources . . ." Please consider adding the following: "To the extent possible, locals, sub-national and domestic food sovereignty needs to be promoted, as opposed to cross- country supply chains which are significantly vulnerable to climate change and external shocks (pandemics)."	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	"Engaging the private sector" More specific examples would be useful for guidance.	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide. Concrete examples and suggestions for private sector involvement are context specific and will need to be developed for the individual concept note or funding proposal.
2.2	Please consider adding the following: "Promoting "green" jobs in the agriculture sector as part of a post- COVID recovery strategy. The economic valuation of ecosystems and ecosystem services need to take into account climate change in order to have an accurate framework for the identification of "green" jobs in the agriculture sector. These can include regenerative farming practices presented above as well as land restoration and reforestation, and restoration of other ecosystems (wetlands, grasslands, etc.)"	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	<u>Under 2.2 Barriers and cross-cutting enablers for the Paradigm-Shifting Pathways, the first barrier states: 'lack of integrated agricultural development planning and capacities...'. Whilst we agree with the existing barrier, we would like to also highlight the transformative potential of agroecology in addressing agricultural development planning and capacities in a holistic and integrative way. We would like to draw your attention once more to the FAO/Biovision study, highlighting how agroecology can provide a framework to take a coordinated approach among all levels, with evidence on the technical (i.e. ecological and socio-economic) and policy potential of agroecology to build resilient food systems. Numerous studies support these arguments, such as the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE http://www.fao.org/3/ca5602en/ca5602en.pdf) and the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD2020 https://www.arc2020.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/FullTextOfTransformationFoodSystems.pdf)</u>	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	Under 2.2 Barriers and cross-cutting enablers for the Paradigm-Shifting Pathways, the third barrier states: 'Limited investment in innovative farming practices, agricultural technologies and business models to incentivize farmers to adapt to a changing climate while maintaining high quality agricultural production, ...'. Recent research (https://www.cidse.org/2020/09/28/analysis-of-funding-flows-to-agroecology/) has shown that also the GCF seriously lacks funding for innovative approaches to farming like agroecology. This limited investment thus also seems to be an issue of limited willingness or perseverance on the side of the GCF to actively support innovative and proven approaches like agroecology, something we would like to see changed in the coming years.	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

2.2	Under 2.2 Barriers and cross-cutting enablers for the Paradigm-Shifting Pathways, the fourth barrier states: 'Lack of access to affordable finance for farmers and local agri-businesses to invest in low-emission agricultural practices and sustainable food systems'. At the same time, the sixth and last barrier states: 'Limited sharing of experiences and knowledge to scale up and replicate successful practices.'. The combination of those two aspects suggests that rather than focussing on generating finance for farmers to invest in improved input supplies, a specific emphasis should be placed on education and the dissemination of knowledge through farmer field schools, extension services and farmer-to-farmer exchanges. Agroecology has shown to be a valuable tool in this regard, highlighting the importance of context-specific knowledge and a co-creation process in which farmers take a leading role. It should consequentially be supported, providing farmers with the necessary knowledge and skills needed to apply successful practices, thereby creating a farmer-led scaling process. Find more information about this in the relevant element (Co-creation and sharing of knowledge) in FAO's 10 Elements of Agroecology (http://www.fao.org/3/i9037en/i9037EN.pdf).	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received. Agroecology has been added across the document and is strongly embedded in the three pathways.
2.2	This section identifies "Empowering communities and local leadership", "Inclusion of women and youth, local and indigenous communities", "capacity building" and "evidence-based learning, knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation" as key enablers. These enablers cannot be integrated siloed from each other if an 'integrated agricultural development planning' is to be achieved. We would like to point to the attentions how agroecological elements (as endorsed by the FAO) are showing pathways of how to integrate these enablers synergistically into agricultural planning.	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received. the guide promotes fully integrated planning and the listed groups are not promoted as silos.
2.2	Inputs are mentioned throughout the document, without first making specific what kind of inputs are meant. By not making the difference between chemical and organic inputs explicit, the GCF seems blind for the fact that chemical fertilizers and pesticides have shown to go paired with long-term human and biodiversity health impacts and climate change acceleration by nutrient excess emitting greenhouse gasses. We would like to suggest to make explicit that the aim is to gradually eradicate chemical inputs, and use organic inputs where these are necessary. Agroecological techniques have shown to fertilize and ensure pest control with limited organic inputs ensuring long-term agricultural practices that are ecologically sound.	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	Under 2.2., it is stated that Engaging the private sector at all scales, given their role in innovative investments and financing is essential for catalyzing change. Suggestion: Engaging the private sector, in particular local enterprises and cooperatives, is essential for catalyzing change and to seek suitable financing for their activities in resilient agriculture.	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received. the sentence refers to private sector at all scales which implies from individual farmer business, to cooperatives, farmer groups, small and medium sized enterprises to larger corporates.
2.2	Farmer decisions not to make desirable climate resilient management decisions is not solely about access to financing, especially for multi-year investments in rehabilitation, renovation, and infrastructure and equipment. Access to information, attitudes toward risk, education and entrepreneurial skills, age of the farmer and opportunities to pass the farm to family members can all play a role.	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	<u>It might be worth mentioning the opportunities and challenges around private sector investment here. The Learning Agenda found that the private sector is already providing a wide range of services in Africa that contribute to the flow of climate and weather information. At least 15 companies already provide services in Africa including: 1) automated weather stations (as part of weather observation systems) or observational data from private stations; 2) GIS data visualization systems; 3) "last-mile" end-user access systems; 4) extrapolated observation data; 5) weather content for advertisers; 6) daily and weekly forecasts; and 7) agricultural decision-support information tied to weather. This brief has recommendations and solutions to specific challenges along these lines: https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2020_USAID_Learning-Agenda_Spotlight-Series-Private-Sector-Solutions-for-Climate-Services.pdf</u>	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

2.2	Also worth noting that even if targeted users receive the information, their access to assets and resources -- such as land, equipment, or inputs -- will influence their ability to act on the information in a timely and useful manner. That has clear gender dimensions as well. See Gender review: Gumucio, T., Hansen, J., Huyer, S., van Huysen, T. (May 2019). Gender-responsive rural climate services: a review of the literature. Climate and Development. (or the original report here)	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.2	More explicit alignment between this figure (Drivers of change across paradigm shifting pathways) and Box 1 (Examples of investment criteria for the three agriculture and food security paradigm pathways) will support users in identifying key drivers, relevant activities, and the linkages. --Alignment among the identified drivers of change and investment criteria will support users in understanding GCF priorities and expectations for agriculture and food security initiatives.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.2	These barriers focus mainly on lack of finance. However often the issue is more the lack of capacity building / access structures etc. This should be elaborated	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is well received. capacity building has been added to the list.
2.2	A "positive enabling environment" is not measured by its "cost-effectiveness", but by how it supports overall effectiveness and equity (of access, participation, etc.)	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. The sentence has been rephrased with overall effectiveness being added.
2.2	As noted in the overarching comments (#7), the draft text here, and throughout the text, absolutely misses the mark in equating small-holders with "small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Every reference in the text to "SMEs" should be replaced by a reference to "micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs)." In terms of smallholder agricultural production, in which women producers dominate, they are disproportionately overrepresented in the "micro-" and "small" categories. Leaving out the micro-segment (which is the one traditionally left out of many financial inclusion efforts or agricultural extension service provisions) leaves out the producer segment most important for securing local/community food production and security and thus disadvantages/discriminates against women producers. It is also inconsistent with professed priorities of the GCF's PSF, PSAG recommendations, and own pilot program approaches (namely the one for MSMEs).	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. SMEs have been corrected to MSMEs.
2.2	It could be useful to include a few words about the concept of maladaptation risks in the agriculture and food security sector, or some guidance on how to consider these risks when designing projects. The risks are mentioned a few times, but without further elaboration.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

2.2	<p>The framing detailed here is in our view ill-conceived: "increase productivity and profits in the agri-food industry and fully engage the entire workforce." The inclusion of women and youth and other marginalised groups is essential, but the first starting point should be that they can achieve resilient livelihoods and food security, whereas profits in the agri-industry as an objective are misplaced here. The necessary transformation should be driven through small scale agriculture where most of the poor are and through their needs and potential contributions. We suggest to reformulate: "Inclusion of women and youth, and other marginalized groups, such as indigenous and traditional peoples, will increase their capacities to build resilience and to pursue climate-resilient livelihoods and their right to adequate food including through small-scale agriculture, as a key driver of the needed paradigm shift" and delete "productivity and profits in the agri-food industry and fully engage the entire workforce"</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received. MSMEs has been added to the sentence and the entire workforce has been subsituted by all groups.</p>
2.2	<p>"Building an enabling context means expanding their access to the basics of work productivity, including land tenure, financing, inputs, extension services, training, markets, paid work, and decision-making authority" is a problematic statement. Centering work productivity instead of local food security and sovereignty leads to the unnecessary inclusion of markets and paid work in this list, which is often not appropriate. That this is the suggestion specifically for Indigenous and traditional peoples is even more strikingly inappropriate, as it assumes that global capitalism is the way forward, rather than approaches that focus on food sovereignty and the right to food and that recognize the sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
2.2	<p><u>Suggest removing the organizational reference to the Climate Smart Agriculture Network. 1. For such an overall guidance document it reads a bit weird if one specific organisation is singled out. 2. This is also odd because the document overall manages to avoid giving much emphasis on the concept of "climate smart agriculture," which has been contested, but rather uses "climate-resilient."</u> 3. <u>The Climate-Smart Youth Network has unfortunate connections and implications with strategies that should not be endorsed by the GCF, through its connections to AGRA. AGRA promoted a Green Revolution in Africa to fight against hunger, by promoting fertilizers, market-oriented crops, pesticides, etc. An IATP study demonstrates that they failed in fighting hunger: https://www.rosalux.de/fileadmin/rls_uploads/pdfs/Studien/False_Promises_AGR_A_en.pdf</u></p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
2.2	<p>A perspective that it is about "shifting small-scale subsistence producers to engage in markets" is an ill-conceived framing as it fails to put the people who are the smallscale producers--the vulnerable people that the GCF intends to support--at the center, while making presumptions about markets as the end goal rather than climate resilience. We would suggest the following formulation: "Expand the assets and capacities of small-scale, subsistence producers for more resilient livelihoods and enhanced productivity, facilitating their contributions to more sustainable food markets"</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received. The suggested sentence has been added.</p>
2.2	<p>Maladaptation is very common in projects across Africa. It would be useful to give examples of maladaptation so that countries when preparing proposals look out against them. How maladaptation risk could be avoided needs to be described clearly in the document</p>	<p>African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>

2.2	4 of the barriers are financial, 1 is policy and 1 is technical. What are the institutional barriers? I think we could also go another level down in terms of what drives some of these barriers.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is welcome. additional barriers have been added such as lack of secure tenure, cultural and behavioral barriers in production and diets, lack of awareness and overall capacity building.
2.2	Do we mean vertical integration through the various actors within the agriculture sector and value chains, or horizontal integration across other sectors? Would it be more appropriate to talk about the lack of robust and flexible processes that incorporate relevant stakeholders across sectors and scales to manage trade-offs and reach alignment. This leads to integrated development planning.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. The integration refers to both vertical and horizontal.
2.2	And capacity	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. Capacity building has been added.
2.2	Is this not a symptom of an underlying root issue? Can we peel this back to say what is underneath causing the limited investment?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is welcome. The sentence including investments has been rephrased and now includes lack of adequate finance, and capacity. There are several other barriers linked to the lack of investments, such as lack of overall awareness, lack of tenure rights, which have been added to the list
2.2	Incentives and powers. Governance arrangements (i.e., power dynamics) between national and subnational levels need to agree where responsibility and capacity should sit in scaling up change.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	This is good but could be further strengthened by emphasising that this must include giving those communities and that local leadership, recognition and voice as an integral part of that empowerment and enabling them to become part of the decision-making process, through effective and inclusive representation.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.2	We have already noted the imperative of public investment in the enabling environment to attract private sector investment. Without this there is limited incentive for the private sector to invest.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. additional text has been added on the role of support small scale business and the sector guide work will continue to expand on how private sector engagement can be best tailored.
2.2	This is also about digital technology. Maybe include in this top line.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. Digital technology has been added to the paragraph.
2.2	GCF investment in locally managed information systems that encourage local and regional peer to peer knowledge sharing and learning would be most valuable. This shifts the emphasis away from top-bottom knowledge sharing and towards local ownership and control.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. the suggestion has been added to the paragraph.

2.2	Rephrase "Broader national and sub-national policy, institutional, and regulatory environments must provide appropriate" to read "Broader national and sub-national policy, institutional, and regulatory environments guided by internationally agreed CFS policy instruments must provide appropriate incentives to foster change at scale."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. the suggestion has been added in part, with additions on ..as guided by relevant internationally policy instruments to help foster change at scale.
2.2	Throughout the text, including on p.17, references to "gender-sensitive" should be replaced with the stronger commitment to "gender-responsiveness" in line with para. 7.5 of the Paris Agreement and as referenced in the GCF's own gender policy..	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	Reducing marginalisation to "cultural elements", as suggested in the "inclusion section" is not appropriate: We suggest to reformulate and say "Social norms, cultural barriers, institutional bias, and discrimination limit inclusion and access, posing a significant challenge."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.2	The word "removal" when it comes to subsidies can be contentious. Would use reorientation, repurposing, or redirecting.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated and the removal has been amended to reorientation.
2.3	What would this look like in practice? For example, would GCF fund national ad campaign efforts to promote low-emissions foods? I think this needs additional consideration	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is welcome. the paragraph suggests that in order to shift the consumption patterns additional studies and evaluations are needed to help map and understand the opportunities for new goods and products to help promote low emissions food.
2.3	Advises on practices cannot be avoided and need to be included e.g. agro ecological practices and transformational adaptation	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is well received. Agroecology is well embedded across the three pathways. additional references to agroecology have been added to the document.

2.3	Mentions on the cold chain should be added: e.g. refrigerated storage	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is welcome. the suggestions have been added.
2.3	What is the value of explaining this in such detail without clear agriculture focus? Ideally remove or make more clear regarding suggestions/meaning for agriculture.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is well received. All sector guides refer to the four approaches to paradigm shift and how they relate to each individual sector. further analysis and suggestions will be developed going forward.
2.3	Clearer guidance on expected grant concessionality levels could be provided. For example, for widely available technologies, lower concessionality of grants could be recommended for target beneficiaries. More innovative/incipient technologies could have a higher concessionality element.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	National Action Plan or National Adaptation Plan NAP? ...	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received and a correction has been made to "National Adaptation Plans"
2.3	... This list could be broader and cover other relevant national planning vehicles as well.	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received. the list is not exclusive, but rather mentions examples.
2.3	The discussion of transformational planning is narrowly focused on the agricultural sector planning and NDC/NAP for agriculture. Given the evolving view that adaptation and climate should be mainstreamed into development planning, policy, and budgeting, we would encourage GCF to broaden this discussion to take advantage of development programming that also promotes climate resilient agriculture.	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	"Transformational planning and programming" We would like to note that If government subsidies are not addressed, achieving transformational government planning or investments will be very challenging.	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	"Mobilization of finance at scale" As mentioned above, for this to be feasible, subsidies will need to be looked at and re-directed.	UNDP	Feedback is well received. this is well embedded in the sector guide across all three pathways.
2.3	"Catalyzing climate innovation promotes business models for reaching scale with interventions that incentivize low-emissions resilient inputs, practices, and technologies to improve productivity" We recommend for this to acknowledge improved productivity that does not negatively impact ecosystems and soil health. Emphasizing increased productivity over food security and food sovereignty may lead to maladaptation.	UNDP	Feedback well received. The emphasis on healthy ecosystems and soil health is well embedded in the guide and part of each pathway.
2.3	"An emphasis on developing and promoting novel and cutting edge vulnerability reducing and risk management technology . . ." Rather than emphasis on technology, we recommend to place emphasis on managing and restoring the health of degraded lands, soils and ecosystems. This comes hand-in-hand understanding climate change and variability risks and reducing the amount of GHG emissions produced by agricultural practices. These practices are technically but not necessarily technologically- sophisticated, and include: silvo-pastoralism, pasture management, agro-forestry, farmland restoration, and regenerative agriculture, among others.	UNDP	See response above
2.3	"Replication of knowledge to . . . leverage existing knowledge platforms to understand . . ." Examples of this would be useful.	UNDP	Feedback is appreciated. Concrete examples will need to be developed for the individual project or programme.

2.3	<p>"Clearly understanding of the enabling context and capacity is vital, and both need to be addressed."</p> <p>It is important that this is sustained over the medium to long -term because one-off short term initiatives of climate resilient ag training/ awareness/ technical capacity will not lead to behavioral change of farmers and value chain actors, including private sector investment interests/ strategies unless they are done continuously and for a longer period of time.</p>	UNDP	Feedback is well received. this is well embedded in the guide and will be promoted across the three pathways.
2.3	<p>"Transformational planning and programming for reconfiguring food systems"</p> <p>Our current supply chains have proven unfit to withstand shocks, such as pandemics. They are also vulnerable to climate change. Therefore, we recommend that, in order to really achieve transformation of food systems, a paradigm shift towards food sovereignty (in those geographies that allow it) as opposed to free and market-based trade of commodities should be promoted. We cannot ignore the economic returns of market-based trade of commodities; these would only change if there is a dramatic shift in consumption and demand. This shift can only be achieved through increased awareness and information about the fragility of the current supply chain systems.</p>	UNDP	Feedback is well received and well noted. this is a key part of the third pathway already and the awareness raising and overall access to information are key aspects for successful changes.
2.3	<p>Under 2.3. Role of the GCF in financing the paradigm shifting pathways, in the third paragraph (Transformational planning and programming) a number of important points for planning and programming are mentioned. At the same time however, this section does not mention any framework suitable in helping planning to be integrated, holistic and community-responsive. An analytical tool that has proven to be successful in this regard are the 10 Elements of Agroecology by FAO, which can be considered a valuable guide for policymakers, practitioners and stakeholders in planning, managing and evaluating agroecological transitions (http://www.fao.org/agroecology/knowledge/10-elements/en/).</p> <p>...</p>	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	<p>... Also the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGGT) are helpful here as they provide guidance on how land tenure rights can be respected and strengthened: Stress the importance of integrating those factors that are essential for shifting ...of who'se some are named under, in a framework that can adapt to local specificities as well as function in landscape scales. The 10 elements of agroecology as endorsed by the FAO, show interlinkages and foster using the synergies of the different elements that need to be addressed in order to outscale the potential of agriculture for climate mitigation and adaptation.</p>	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	<p>Stress the importance of integrating those factors that are essential for shifting ...of who'se some are named under, in a framework that can adapt to local specificities as well as function in landscape scales. The 10 elements of agroecology as endorsed by the FAO, show interlinkages and foster using the synergies of the different elements that need to be addressed in order to outscale the potential of agriculture for climate mitigation and adaptation.</p>	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	<p>In the paragraph on engaging the private sector it states "At farm and local levels, it means shifting small-scale, subsistence producers to engage in markets and supporting the growth of local, and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) providing inputs, services and market access". This statement seems to neglect the fact that small-scale and subsistence farmers have been proved essential for fostering local food security and sovereignty (highlighted due to the covid-19 crises), by strengthening local and regional value chains and markets. No reference is made about what specific markets are meant in this sentence. This should be made explicit. If it is referring to international markets, various studies (http://www.fao.org/3/i9021en/i9021en.pdf, HLPE, IAASTD, FAO-Agroecology, IPES-FOOD money flows) have made evident the focus on integration in global markets has counterproductive effects, as vertical value chains and global competition from lower-priced products make it impossible for local food producers to compete. Instead, without neglect international markets we would suggest state 'at farm and local levels, it means shifting small-scale, subsistence producers to engage in local and regional markets and supporting the growth of local, and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), bringing producer and consumer closer together, safeguard agro-biodiversity and fostering local economies by reducing inputs and supporting knowledge exchange services and fostering local and regional market access". Not to neglect international markets but to prioritize local markets and support territorial development.</p>	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received. micro enterprises have been added across the document and the local and regional value chains and markets are fully embedded in the promoted pathways.

2.3	How about areas with large population densities, peri-urban areas, etc.?	GIZ	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	Available information from these services that reach farmers should also be analyzed! Once digitized, the quality of these services can be better monitored.	GIZ	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	Food systems are not limited to national boundaries - how is this being considered and how is cross-country collaboration, regional policies, etc. fostered?	GIZ	Feedback is well received. the third pathway on food systems looks across all scales of food systems and their sub systems from local to global levels.
2.3	Does this imply that proposals must demonstrate how they relate to each of these?	GCF Alternative BM	Feedback is well received. Proposals must always strive to meet the four pronged approach to paradigm shift.
2.3	Not sure if is advisable to treat certification and regulation as the same.	GCF Alternative BM	Feedback is well received. additional text has been added to highlight that the respective enabling conditions need to be in place for certification and regulation in order to be effective.
2.3	The possibility of a project resulting in negative environmental issues, like groundwater depletion, freshwater pollution, land degradation and biodiversity loss, is not properly addressed. Environmental aspects are spoken about mostly as potential (and positive) co-benefits of these interventions. There should be some consideration, starting at the project design stage, of the potential negative impacts of these projects (or negative co-benefits) as well. This should also include social and gender aspects. The avoidance of these negative impacts should be a requirement for the approval of projects by the GCF. (The requirement of ESS documents during project approval does not preclude the specific necessity of ensuring this guidance is used in designing appropriate projects to "do good," rather than hoping that the ESS assessments prove acceptable after project design.)	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	There is a reference to the term Nature Based Solutions (NBS) without any clarity and/or defining what is NBS and its relevance in the agriculture sector. Currently, no UN agency has defined the term NBS nor it is part of any negotiated text under the UNFCCC (or any other official UN convention such as the CBD), so the GCF should not include this term in the guide.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. NBS references have been deleted and will not be part of the guide.
2.3	Although the context provided in the paragraphs above include many examples of actions and strategies that could be implemented, this section falls short in defining more clearly the activities and actions that could serve as guidance to projects proposals, beyond the general concepts that are provided here. We understand that the guidance should be indicative and not prescriptive and actions may vary according to local/national context, but more concrete options and examples (as provided above) could help to contextualize possible actions under the pathways	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later

2.3	Rephrase, "promoting stress-tolerant (e.g. drought adapted) seed, breed" with "promoting stress-tolerant (e.g. drought adapting) indigenous (heirloom) seeds and breeds, as well as and germplasm development and delivery systems"	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but not included. The paragraph indicates the same as the suggested text.
2.3	Currently it says, "some investments could provide low-emissions outcome" ..., instead it should read, "Priority investments must be directed to low-emissions outcomes..."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but will not be included. The paragraph already points to the same conclusion.
2.3	Rephrase "to meet users' needs, so that the ultimate users are directly involved" to "to meet users' needs, and protecting the food system workers' rights, so that the ultimate users are..."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.
2.3	Rephrase, "Replication of knowledge to shift finance flows should" to "Replication of knowledge to shift finance flows from climate warming-subsidies in agriculture (such as the ones going to high emission agriculture) to climate cooling low-emission agriculture should"	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received, but goes beyond the scope of the current sectoral guide.

2.3	Measures such as eco-schemes could reward farmers for improved environmental and climate performance, including managing and storing carbon in the soil, and improved nutrient management to increase water quality and reduce emissions.	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	SEE COMMENT ABOVE: the development of seeds and crop varieties should not be done at the expenses of biodiversity and it should follow the principles of organic farming to the highest extent possible.	Board Member	Feedback is well received. the promotion of stree tolerant varieties will be done in parallel to biodiversity conservation and improved management and will follow international standards.
2.3	<u>There is also a related huge limitation of indigenous peoples in practicing their traditional knowledge because of the issue/insecure land tenure, which is crucial for food sovereignty. Many of the areas being occupied and managed by indigenous peoples are governed by customary tenure but most are not legally recognized and demarcated. The sectoral guidance is not very clear how this should be addressed in the document. [Additional information about the importance of securing indigenous land tenure, including in relation to agriculture, can be found in CLARA's "Missing Pathways to 1.5C: The Role of the Land Sector in Ambitious Climate Action: https://www.climatelandambitionrightsalliance.org/report]</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	<u>In support of interventions above on public finance, Rephrase, (PES) "and supporting institutional arrangements" with "and other publicly financed institutional arrangements (such as the conservation reserve program in the United States see at https://www.fsa.usda.gov/programs-and-services/conservation-programs/conservation-reserve-program/)</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	<u>Pathway 1 is an excellent place to integrate the 10 elements of agroecology, http://www.fao.org/agroecology/knowledge/10-elements/en/ an FAO publication shows the contributions of agroecology. This has been endorsed by the Agricultural committee of FAO in 2018.</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is welcome. Agroecology is well embedded across all three pathways in particular pathway 1. additional references to agroecology has been made. Furthermore pathway one is now title resilient agroecology and focuses more on agroecology

2.3	Would be useful to look into economic resilience of farmers and supply chain actors or maintaining / improving income over the short-medium term	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	How does data governance sit within this gathering of data and knowledge on platforms?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. the governance and use of data and platforms will be promoted to be open source and access for all stakeholders to stimulate better knowledge sharing and change.
2.3	Should pathway plans also be adaptive and sequenced based on trigger events (i.e., adaptive pathways) which can lead to pipelines of projects?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	It gives too much space for the private sector, and more precisely the technology sector. PPPs can help alleviate but it has to be monitored with scrutiny.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. private sector includes farmer to farmer, micro farmer organizations up to large scale corporates across all levels.
2.3	<u>The endorsement of PPPs here is not warranted; PPPs should not be assumed to be a positive and appropriate mechanism for funding. Evidence such as this report highlight their destructive nature despite the promises made: https://www.eurodad.org/historyrepppeated</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

2.3	In the mobilizing finance section in support of "agri-food corporate investments" there is no discourse of addressing and avoiding related agricultural (export-oriented) investments' negative implications such as monoculture production, danger of landgrabs, threats to biodiversity. Avoiding such negative outcomes are not environmental or social "co-benefits" according to the GCF understanding, but inherent determinants of a resilient low-emission agriculture and food system.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	Is a major barrier here as mentioned above, "developing the public and digital infrastructure" which I would imagine is internet coverage, penetration, equity of access, and knowledge of how to use? Would this underlying infrastructure be part of the transformational planning needed?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	One of the barriers to this is data governance and data sharing. How does GCF see this being managed through this driver?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	Do we think this sits in the private or public sphere?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is welcome. The sentence refers to an issue going across both public and private sector. Private sector in this guide involves everything from small scale farmer groups to large corporates and would need to be tackled across all these groups.
2.3	<u>Again this entire section needs to be guided by the Global Strategic Framework (http://www.fao.org/cfs/home/products/onlinegsf/en Further to help with this, it will be important to use the evidence presented by CFS-HLPE on the global narrative on Food systems http://www.fao.org/3/ca9731en/ca9731en.pdf</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	Should this be the focus? Transport to urban areas can be cheaper than to other rural markets which are bypassed resulting in higher food prices and poor nutrition outcomes for those depending on that rural market.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. The sentence refers to the growth of peri and peri urban markets. additional text has been added including peri urban and has embedded the production of food in peri urban areas as well.
2.3	add "nutritious"	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. nutritious has been added.

2.3	Circular bio-based economy in agriculture is not included although having a great potential for mitigation and adaptation in the agricultural sector. For example, advanced bio-refineries that produce bio-fertilisers, bioenergy, and bio-chemicals offering opportunities for the transition to a climate-neutral food production.	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. There are many linkages to the energy sector guides where in between the two sectors these issues are very important and can be further developed at the project stage level.
2.3	Certification systems should be encouraged, while at the same time trying to make these standards more accessible for small producers both from an economic and a bureaucratic (technical difficulties and lack of expertise), point of view. To date certification systems for sustainability are often financially accessible for large-scale companies plantations operating as profit-oriented monocultures. Moreover, the consumers pay a premium price to the smallholders for certified products that is much lower than the smallholders' economic loss to comply with certification guidelines. We suggest to push for a better third party assessments of sustainable certification in particular for smallholder certification schemes.	Board Member	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	Figure 3 is well done, clear and informative	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is much appreciated.
2.3	pg 23 Digital and ITC developments are crucial - private sector has important role here as while governments might regulate this, they certainly don't have the capacity for development. Private sector can be a solutions provider, this should be highlighted more as a solution for risk management services	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	The document does not state how GCF plans to allocate financial resources to support the Agriculture and Food Security Transformation Agenda and the underpinning principles (e.g., 'Return on Investment' philosophy, catalyze additional funding, investments with high "additionality" such as those that deliver both adaptation and mitigation benefits).	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	What are the GCF's targets? The whole document is very nice, but also very high level. By providing clear targets and a roadmap the document would become much more powerful and also put some responsibility into the GCF	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide. The guide seeks to set the directions in the sector identifying where GCF can play a key role. Specific context based solutions and interventions will need to be presented when developing project ideas, concept notes and funding proposals.
2.3	page 22, bullet 1: add vertical and horizontal integration to maximize nexus synergies and avoid tradeoffs.	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	page 22, bullet 3 but valid more generally: add direct support to overcome income losses due to investment in CSA for smallholders. This is among the most important reasons why investment in sustainable practices has such low adoption rates despite clear long-term benefits (which farmers recognize). But the costs of adoption and maintenance of sustainable systems are often inhibitory. These barriers are also totally offputting for private sector investors because of low ROIs, high upfront costs and long-term benefits. The GCF needs to distinguish between the needs of different farmer types much more explicitly in order to propose the right tools	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

2.3	Should there be consideration about implementation periods? Related to the fact that changes and reforms that build enabling environments, through transformational planning and programming, take time to be implemented, and this is often not adequately reflected in the relatively short implementation periods of projects that address these issues.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	Figure 3: Drivers of change across paradigm shifting pathways, Edit content in the figure to reflect these inputs. (all figures must be edited to reflect comments)	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	It would be more readable to have all practices examples in one place, in 2.1 pathway 1 for instance	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
2.3	National Action Plans are presumably National Adaptation Plans, another UNFCCC instrument, as NDCs are listed first and NAP is the accepted acronym for a National Adaptation Plan. (See also, p.3, for errant use of "National Action Plans.")	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	National Action Plans have been changed accordingly to National Adaptation Plans

2.3	<p>"A comprehensive approach includes ensuring farmers know when and how to plant and manage crops, have access to affordable inputs and seeds, and can access output markets that incentivize crops produced through low-emissions and climate-resilient means" is not actually a comprehensive approach, promoting an input-driven, market-based approach rather than ecologically-based approaches proven to be more sustainable and climate-resilient. This sentence should be removed.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
2.3	<p>Rephrase, "promoting stress-tolerant (e.g. drought adapted) seed, breed" with "promoting stress-tolerant (e.g. drought adapting) indigenous (heirloom) seeds and breeds, as well as and germplasm development and delivery systems"</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
2.3	<p>Currently it says, "some investments could provide low-emissions outcome" ..., instead it should read, "Priority investments must be directed to low-emissions outcomes..."</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received. sentence has been updated to read investments should provide</p>
2.3	<p>Rephrase "to meet users' needs, so that the ultimate users are directly involved" to "to meet users' needs, and protecting the food system workers' rights, so that the ultimate users are..."</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>

2.3	Rephrase, "Replication of knowledge to shift finance flows should" to "Replication of knowledge to shift finance flows from climate warming-subsidies in agriculture (such as the ones going to high emission agriculture) to climate cooling low-emission agriculture should"	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	pg 25 "mobilization of investment at scale" re PPPs. Perhaps consider a box at the end of the document where the case studies are with something like "examples of PPPs with blended finance" - it could be reference to here on page 25 e.g. "see section X for examples of PPPs". This allows both public and private sector (PS) to conceptualise, allowing public sector to see how others have crowded in PS as well as for PS DAEs / IAEs to gain ideas for proposing to public sector solutions	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
2.3	Agroforestry? Given the focus of this piece is agriculture	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is well received. the sentence refers to the linkages to other sectors. Agroforestry is targeted both by the agriculture sector guide and the forest and land use, and ecosystems guides.
3	Financing paradigm-shifting pathways in agriculture and food systems for food security is better suited as a title and through the all document	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received but the chosen title will remain.
3	Correspondingly (see comment above), Sec. 3 lacks a clear statement on the weighting the GCF will give in channeling finance – public finance versus blended finance instruments.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3	Financing for locally led adaptation and resilience must give local institutions and communities more direct access to finance and decision-making power over how adaptation actions are defined, prioritized, designed, implemented with a focus on ensuring that women, youth, indigenous peoples and historically marginalized groups are able to access the finance and participate in decision-making. This implies identifying opportunities and modalities for financing (grants, loans) that are accessible to farmers organizations, MSMEs, small producer cooperatives, etc. The focus on scale along with the complexity of accessing climate finance creates significant barriers for locally-based organizations. Delivery of public and blended finance must take this into account in the design of financial instruments in order for targeted communities – those hardest hit by the climate crisis – to adapt.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

3	Prioritize financing that supports the livelihoods of small-scale farmers disproportionately impacted by climate change and invest in actions that support adaptation, mitigation and loss and damage resulting from impacts beyond what can be adapted to in the agriculture sector with a view to strengthening NDCs.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	This is well received. The sectoral guide and proposed pathways all strive to meet this point and support meeting NDC targets through livelihood diversification and increasing resilience of vulnerable rural poor populations.
3	The way the guidelines are framed, there is a real risk that GCF investments are weighted towards big agribusiness and ends up re-enforcing existing business models instead of supporting small scale farmers. It's important that 1) concessional finance should not be used to support big ag and 2) where investments in big agribusiness are made through blended finance instruments , they are subject to clear safeguards – including safeguards around land acquisition processes and FPIC (which has been a big missing piece in some recent GCF investments.).	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3	good section overall	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	feedback is appreciated
3.1	Suggest “both global returns on adaptation and mitigation, and direct returns to producers and those involved across value chains	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received. the suggested sentence has been included.
3.1	It's very high-level, with no detail. I'd refer to it as an “overview”, not a “guide”.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	Should this be included in all Sectoral Guides?	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	Why this ratio? As presented, it seems entirely arbitrary.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	In the figure, “reduce governments intervention in agricultural financial parkets to open space for private financial service providers” is inadequate and is, according to us, to be suppressed. Public interventions are not only to be reduced, they can also be used efficiently	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.1	This definition differs from OECD definition: https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/blended-finance-principles/	GIZ	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	This chapter is not clear what the climate finance settings is bringing to the blended finance discussion. Funds such as LDCF are not looking for blending finance and don't have a blended finance mechanism, body or objective.	GIZ	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

3.1	Are we talking about public or private agri-finance? Could this be clarified?	GCF BM Advisor	feedback is welcome. the 29% refer to both public and private agri finance.
3.1	How does this relate to the agriculture sector? It would be best to keep the guidance short and to the point, or tailor things only to agriculture.	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	It is unclear where these numbers come from and how they relate to another. E.g., where does the 5:4:1 come from? How does it relate to the 65%? What is meant with non-agri finance? Please substantiate or revise	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.1	Paradigm shift in advancing sustainable pathways for FSN must start with leveraging more public financing options for pathways that ensure growing crops on low-emission, highly productive, diversified farms, to enhance the food security of the smallholder producers and other food system workers.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	We highly question the integration of the World Bank "Maximizing Finance for Development Framework", on p.27, as this framework is totally oriented to open local production to global markets. This kind of approach does not align with a food sovereignty perspective. The related implicit and equally inappropriate reference is to the World Bank's "Doing Business" (https://www.doingbusiness.org/) categorizations and approaches: these are mostly about deregulations and weakening of labor and environmental protections. This framework and reference is certainly not applicable for a discussion on climate resiliency with a food sovereignty/human rights framing of agriculture and food systems.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

3.1	<p>This section is wrongly oriented toward mobilizing private resources and blended finance. In the last two decades, there has been increasing emphasis on mobilizing private financial resources to fill resource gaps, including through 'blended finance' approaches, that use public, philanthropic or supranational funding to "leverage", "unlock" or "catalyse" private investments. These approaches themselves are symptoms of, rather than solutions to, ongoing austerity that constrains public funds, and there is evidence of negative social impacts, including violations of Indigenous and local community and peasant rights. Despite continual optimism about the volume of private capital available to fill the resourcing gap, evidence from the last thirty years of efforts puts this emphasis into serious question. There are significant concerns about blended finance for development purposes, including in the agriculture sector. The gist of the entire discourse/chapter allows only for a small and narrow role for public financing and sees it otherwise only as an enabler of private investment through blending approaches. The focus in the section seems to be more on financial structuring and financialization as an end in and of itself (otherwise what is the utility of naming a list of 10 financial instruments without accompanying glossaries that would explain their respective pros and cons), instead of a means to an end. This goes so far as to mention on p.29 the introduction of a co-financing requirement (which has no place in such a guidance): "Where national capacity exists, this could go as so far as to require a private sector partner that can leverage private capital." (p. 29). The goal of this discussion should be instead focused on increasing the access to finance particularly to those domestic and local actors that are providing food security as a local public good. The potential for devolution of financing approaches is only briefly mentioned, as are the options for joint/cooperative financial participation (cooperative banking for example).</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
3.1	<p><u>Carbon credit is a discredited mechanism; replace carbon credit and suggest instead, carbon tax (See reference to 3550 plus economists advising on taxing carbon emissions – a sure stream of public finance: https://clcouncil.org/economists-statement/)</u></p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
3.1	<p>Glad to see this recognition that the priorities of small-scale farmers have to be met and the importance of channeling grant-based funds locally. The ideas in this paragraph should be more broadly integrated throughout the document as this is not only the role of domestic finance, but international finance such as provided through the GCF.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>

3.1	Community participatory processes could provide opportunities for Indigenous Peoples participation. How can this guidance help promote and ensure an effective engagement, in case of the IPs, ensuring FPIC process?	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	<u>"Considering additional revenue streams, such as project establishment support and carbon finance" should be rephrased to "...and carbon finance through mechanisms such as the carbon tax, gaining support /as proposed by https://clcouncil.org/economists-statement/</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	Market-based approaches like Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) do not represent a major new source of private finance, and have mixed biodiversity and livelihood impacts. In many cases, PES have shown to have no positive outcomes and even negative impacts. Where programmes have been most successful at addressing land use change linked with biodiversity loss, they have been well-integrated with local traditions and institutions, with strong representation of local values and knowledge and equitable benefit-sharing. So while PES can be a useful tool, it has been insufficient to address resource funding needs, and rarely addresses large-scale drivers of biodiversity loss or climate change.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	The role of a standard grant, a financial instrument which many vulnerable developing countries are requesting and make use of in the GCF including for agriculture related funding proposals, is not visible. Perhaps it was intended to be captured in "concessional capital," but "grant support" should be explicitly mentioned.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received. The grant based projects take up the majority of the current portfolio of agriculture sector. grants are well embedded across the three pathways.
3.1	Figure 3 is well done, clear and informative	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received

3.1	Apart from some examples briefly mentioned in Figure 4, it will be useful to showcase some examples on the ways to effectively blend various financing instruments from various sources (i.e. structures of risk sharing scheme, financing sources and who does this structuring etc.)	Asian Development Bank	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	There is mention of AU's commitments under Maputo Declaration (2003) but no reference to Malabo Declaration (2014). The context in which the Maputo Declaration is referenced is not appropriate. We propose that the words "Signatories of the Maputo Declaration (African Union) aim to commit 10% of their national budget allocation to agricultural development. The African Union-NEPAD Agreement further specifies that the equivalent of 1% of GDP will be dedicated to funding agricultural research and development. Progress towards these goals are tracked by the African Union Development Agency" be deleted altogether.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is welcome and the sentence has been deleted.
3.1	The reference to ESG improvements is interesting but we suggest to avoid diluting the strength of this approach by making reference to ESG generic standards, and instead try to mostly stick to concrete improvements in the supply chains.	Climate Finance Associate, E2C2, ERBD	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	Would be useful to know current progress on these so that GCF proposals can leverage these targets where there is headroom.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.1	Worth including an additional point on public domestic finance to derisk investments made from private actors	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.1	I would think this is a precursor to community and stakeholder participatory planning and budgeting to drive demand led solutions and project pipelines that can be aggregated at sub-national or national level?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.1	I think this is important and could be unpacked further. Which of the three finance gaps is sitting with these SMEs? Are there different risk/return profiles for these finance gaps.	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	Feedback is welcome. SMEs has been changed to MSMEs to showcase that the guide reaches from micro level enterprises. The detailed gaps and opportunities across the various groups will be further detailed in next iteration as it goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
3.1	These can have high transaction costs and capacity needs making it hard to scale up pilot projects that are grant funded or use concessional capital. Is there a way to streamline accessing and blending this myriad of financing sources?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.1	Why are we highlighting passages in bold in this section but not elsewhere? Highlighting's a good idea, but we should be consistent.	GCF Secretariat	A final editing will be carried out
3.1	Could links to these sources be provided?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received but will not be addressed at this stage.

3.2	Given the emphasis throughout the document on the need for multiple financial mechanisms, and particularly the need to leverage private sector finance, additional focus on why GCF agriculture programs rely primarily on grants, and how that might be shifted, would be useful in this document.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.2	As noted above, this question deserves additional consideration and elaboration in the document.	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.2	pg 32 Table 1, great to have examples. We wonder if you might consider expanding one or two of these . If 2, use one public and one private sector examples. Also include gender specific stats and/ or intentions to assist women/ youth etc if possible	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
3.2	Sustainability. The document does not point out the key markers for sustainability of an agriculture and food security project? Are there any best practices of innovative approaches and business models that have been successfully in achieving sustainability?	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
3.2	Having a dedicated TC and concessional finance programme supported by GCF funds on these topics could help structure new types of green finance projects in challenging transactions (e.g. working capital transaction with agri clients, noting that accounting for climate benefits from working capital transactions is not straightforward). The requirements that GCF presents for successful proposals however appear extensive, and the trade offs between different objectives GCF is trying to reach should be considered. The transaction costs involved in developing a GCF programme are already relatively high, and increasing the complexity of the criteria for successful programmes in this area may disadvantage otherwise strong proposals with significant potential for impact.	Climate Finance Associate, E2C2, ERBD	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
3.2	How do funding levels compare to other sectors? And if moderate why is that? Lack of demand or lack of aggregation to scale or other?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.2	Is this enough to overcome the barriers identified in this driver? Or are there additional actors / underlying conditions that need to be in place before the PPF is used?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
3.2	Will GCF pivot to more of this focus in projects?	Advisor to BM Jos Wheatley	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
4	1. These seem to be Country/Project examples rather than case studies. 2. Consider following a similar structure when presenting the information (e.g. Country, project name, project aim, project partners/financing, current stage, results/achievement/challenges etc.). 3. Consider addressing the GCF six investment criteria (following section) when presenting the examples. This can provide an illustrative example of the types of projects GCF approves and the criteria these projects fulfilled.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
4	... 3. Consider addressing the GCF six investment criteria (following section) when presenting the examples. This can provide an illustrative example of the types of projects GCF approves and the criteria these projects fulfilled.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.

4	Consider specifying whether this refers to paradigm-shifting pathways.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but will not be included at this stage.
4	Lessons learned from the current project portfolio could be identified more clearly in order to guide future projects	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
4	<u>Add Farmer-managed Natural Regeneration as country case study for transformational planning and programming and/or catalyzing climate innovation.</u> https://www.bothends.org/uploaded_files/document/LR_Regreen_the_Sahel_WE_B.pdf	Both ENDS	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4	The section on case studies needs to include many and more varied examples from across Africa, Asia, Pacific, the Caribbean and the Latin America, to bring out a more robust “lessons” pool. The current list is too small to give a clear picture of innovative climate smart investments in the agriculture sector. Some of the projects cited have just been approved by GCF or they are in the early stages of implementation and therefore they have not been tested on many aspects especially the sustainability.	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4	To shorten the text, could these cases be in an annex?	GCF BM Advisor	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4.1	Should these be identified?	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4.2	Consider mentioning the name of the bank.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4.2	Consider providing more information which clearly states the role of each actor (e.g. who trains the farmers?).	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4.3	Is this connected to the one above? If not, please consider specifying the project name.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
4.3	<u>The Agroecology Fund is a good example of how funding can support and upscale existing resilient agriculture and food systems.</u> https://www.agroecologyfund.org/our-approach	Both ENDS	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
4.3	Why these four vcs and regions?	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
4.3	Article 6 of the Paris Agreement is very important for unlocking private sector financing. The document does not make any reference to the potential of Article 6 in increasing climate smart investments in the agriculture sector	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
4.4	I suggest to start the paragraph by giving a description of the project and its goal.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
4.4	Should this be “opportunities”?	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received. correction has been made.

4.4	Pursuant to Decision 4/23 – Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture (KJWA) the constituted bodies under the convention and the GCF would put in place measures to implement outcomes from KJWA topics. The document does not make any mention of the KJWA. Does it mean that GCF does not recognize decision 4/23 -KJWA?	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5	Alternative framing ... In referring here to the "investment criteria," this guidance misses the opportunity to note that for agriculture, food security, and food sovereignty, central to numerous criteria is that GCF investments need to be assessed against human rights criteria, including the right to food, water, and health, and in alignment with the SDG goals. All of it, while reducing climate risks, and simultaneously helping meet mitigation targets .	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
5	Equity needs to be considered as a core principle for investments in this sector. While equity impacts are fleetingly implied in some sections, it is not explicitly mentioned as an overarching principle that needs to frame all investments and guide the overall application of explicit investment guidance (with a focus on issues of improving food security, increasing income, empowering women, producers, youth and others who are vulnerable to climate change). An equity lens is a crucial tool for ensuring maladaptation does not result from projects and activities supported through the GCF.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5	"Where investments in this sector are intended to support mitigation benefits, it is important to clarify that emissions reductions can only be seen as one of multiple benefits (and not the dominant one) in this sector. A focus on support for agricultural zero emissions as a stand-alone goal is wrong and must be accompanied by a strong and overarching focus on zero hunger goals as well as livelihoods, biodiversity, etc. while reducing GHG concentration. Approaches may include agroecology and agroforestry, for example, but must be in compliance with international obligations, including human rights and REDD+ safeguards."	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
5	Duration of agriculture projects. The document does not speak about the optimal duration for a successful agriculture and food security project. How long should an agriculture project be implemented (3, 5, 7, 10 years etc)?	African Group of Negotiators Experts Support (AGNES)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5	Recommend moving this section to before section 3	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
5.1	Are the subsequent questions in this bullet subsidiary questions of this one?	GCF Secretariat	The feedback is well received. the questions are guiding questions for each of the six investment criteria to help support the achievement of the IC.

5.1	Are the subsequent questions in this bullet subsidiary questions of this one?	GCF Secretariat	The feedback is well received. the questions are guiding questions for each of the six investment criteria to help support the achievement of the IC.
5.1	The investment criteria are likely immutable but we would encourage GCF to consider options for more explicit focus on thinking about/planning for sustainability beyond the GCF project. After decades of development projects, sustainability continues to be challenging because of failure to commit financial and staff resources to programs tested in GEF, AF, GCF, MDB, and donor-funded projects to sustain or take to scale. The notion of sustainability is embedded in criteria 3 and 6, but could be made more explicit.	Winrock Consortium (consisting of Winrock International, Center for Climate Strategies, and Climate Law and Policy)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.1	"The GCF investment criteria and examples of key questions broadly assessed . . ." More specific guidance that is tailored to ag/food security sector on the key elements that constitute "high" "medium" "low" ratings of GCF projects would be useful as these broad general questions have already been presented in various existing GCF documents.	UNDP	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.1	Box 1 Impact "Tons of CO2 sequestered and . . ." Please consider adding the following: "...improved soil and soil's microbiome's health; improved ecosystem services (water infiltration, micro-climate regulation, pollinators, insects, etc.)"	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.1	Box 1 Impact "Farmers using digital information weekly . . ." What is the reason for "weekly"?	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.1	Box 1 Impact " . . . total value of SME loans; innovative and . . ." We advise that this should not be a measure of impact. It is advised to be careful that the schemes hereby proposed do not result in increasing the debt to SMEs and farmers. Alternative wording could be: "availability of innovative and flexible credits for the adoption of climate-resilient agricultural practices"	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.1	Box 1 Paradigm shift "What are key leverage points & actions for production . . ." Please consider adding the following: ""low-emission and climate-informed"	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.1	Box 1 Country ownership Please note that this may be challenging in the context of agriculture. Many of the innovative, climate-resilient and low-emission agricultural practices may not necessarily be favored by governments unless there is some awareness raising through demonstrated economic gains of adopting such practices.	UNDP	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.1	Possibly this could be measured in different categories such as: 1. Socio Economic Impact - measurable impacts for households, individuals, youth. The impact in gender. The impact in jobs created, production changes etc. 2. Environmental impacts - change in deforestation, change in erosion, change in environmental/forestry policies etc.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.1	pg 36 Six investment criteria - good to have these listed, perhaps consider saying in the introduction where you hyperlink to the GCF website on the criteria something like "or see page 36 for overview of GCF Investment Criteria for Impactful proposals"	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide

5.1	BOX 1 is good, clear and concise. Is there a way to add more private sector considerations to this? The idea is that if most climate finance is to come from the PS, then how do we crowd in the PS more from new jobs to country ownership of a workforce able to sustain development pathways that are paradigm shifting	Executive Director, Climate Markets & Investment Association	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.2	This is a dangerous criterion, which could encourage loans to SMEs who are unable to repay the interest or principal. Suggest replacing with something on the line of 'increased profit of SMEs as a result of support'.	GCF Secretariat	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of the current guide
5.2	Is there guidance on best practice for how to quantify and report this information? Emission reduction impacts related to land use, particularly soil carbon and avoided deforestation are complex and quantitatively rigorous, as are other elements listed here. Literature on quantifying resilience, especially at local scale, has advanced and might inform how this criteria is considered and what guidance is given. While maladaptation is mentioned above repeatedly, it is absent here, but should be considered as an impact	Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.2	Centralizing all examples here might be more readable .The examples that were here were not relevant. Having irrigated land cannot be a goal, the goal is to have resilient and low emission system, and depending on local conditions, on the system chosen, irrigation will be in it or not. New breeds adopted is also not a paradigm shift practice.	GCF BM Advisor (France)	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.2	These are helpful but as they are examples they do not provide much guidance on what should not be part of a proposal, or what could be part of a proposal.	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.2	Are the following paragraphs the guidance provided? This leaves the purpose of the rest of the text in the document somewhat unclear – is this guidance or analytical background or something else?	GCF Alternative BM	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later
5.2	This box is helpful as it provides guidance to AEs and NDAs and it should get a more central place in this sectoral guide	GCF BM Advisor (Germany)	Feedback is well received
5.2	"Paradigm shifts are most likely with a strong enabling context, involvement of government, businesses, farmers' organizations . . ." This should also take into account the ability to sustain long-term change/transformation in the sector through the various policy/regulatory/capacity building/systems work that is critical in ensuring a whole of systems transformation.	UNDP	agree. This is well embedded across the guide.
5.2	The construction of "What new practices, innovations or varieties are ready for regional expansion with a strong potential for replication?" as the paradigm-shifting question reveals the inadequate definition of paradigm shifting that this guide adopts. This paradigm-shift is actually not paradigm-shifting at all, but a continuation of agribusiness expansion, endorsement of GMOs, and continued fossil-fuel inputs. True paradigm shifting questions would be around What existing traditional and Indigenous practices can be adopted on a larger-scale? How can land access and tenure be granted to marginalized communities?	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Disagree

5.2	<p>This list of impact measures are inappropriate because they are not a measure of GCF's goals for climate resilience and mitigation, serving vulnerable communities, but instead a list of impact measures that capture how well agribusiness and market-based integration approaches have won. Nearly all of these measures could be positively met and yet there could be less climate resilience (through erosion of food sovereignty and destruction of local food systems, etc.) and greater GHG emissions (through loss of biodiversity, monocrop approaches, etc.). The list of impact measures mentions employment with no measure for livelihoods, tons produced with no measure for how many people are food secure (though there is a mention of "improved nutritional outcomes"), and value of SME loans rather than number of people supported through loans or grants as smallholder farmers. The incentives for climate resilient practices are measured rather than the practices themselves. Instead, frameworks such UNCF's four pillars of food security could guide measurement of the impact the GCF should be catalyzing.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
5.2	<p>The construction of "What are key leverage points & actions for production, supporting business models & supply chains? Shift in what foods people want." as the paradigm-shifting question is inappropriate and reflects the conflation of means and ends highlighted in the overarching comments. The goal is not supporting business models and supply chains; the question must be oriented toward key leverage points for supporting resilient, locally-adapted food systems, food sovereignty, and stable livelihoods. Additionally, the mention of "what foods people want" again reifies a consumer-driven model rather than the question of how food systems will support a global shift to more plant-based diets in the developed world, in line with climate goals, rather than a model that relies heavily on the export of meat.</p>	<p>As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
5.2	<p>Mitigation criteria should be at the heart of the reconfiguration of the food system pathway, as stated earlier in the description.</p>	<p>Board Member</p>	<p>The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document. The comment will be saved for later</p>
5.2	<p>Recommend including in the executive summary</p>	<p>Advisor to BM Mathew Haarsager</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but will not be addressed at this stage.</p>
5.2	<p>We suggest spelling BAU the first time it appears in the document (here)</p>	<p>World Food Programme (WFP)</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but will not be addressed at this stage.</p>
5.3	<p>"Positive paradigm shifts are most likely when all relevant actors are informed or involved in charting . . ."</p> <p>Please advise to acknowledge that this should lead to changes in behavior, views and actions from BAU ag practices towards climate resilient systems/practices.</p>	<p>UNDP</p>	<p>Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.</p>
5.3	<p>"Real innovation will need to happen in relation to partnerships that include businesses, farmers' organizations, and civil society."</p> <p>It is important that these are also supported and advanced by close collaboration with government for policy and regulatory enabling environment. This is a barrier in many of the countries we work in and is important to acknowledge.</p>	<p>UNDP</p>	<p>Agree, this is crucial. This is well embedded across the pathways and will need to be well developed across the different project specific contexts.</p>
5.3	<p>"Therefore, a paradigm shift in agriculture and food security should ensure that climate-resilience, poverty alleviation, and development approaches within countries are all well aligned."</p> <p>We recommend to also include that this should be aligned with planetary limits/ environmental sustainability, for all the reasons already brought up previously.</p>	<p>UNDP</p>	<p>Agree, see response above.</p>

5.4	Conclusion: this whole paragraph can be moved to the Executive Summary	Head, Impact Assessment and Adaptation UNEP DTU Partnership	Diasagree. A final editing will be carried out.
1.2, 1.3	1.2 Global adaptation and mitigation targets: Where is the sector today? and it's following section must highlight the differences between climate-friendly, low-GHG-emissions agriculture with multiple co-benefits and, and on the other hand, high-GHG-emission fossil-fuel based agriculture, a huge contributor to the climate crisis. In fact, it is also important to assert that industrialized, mono-culture agricultural practices in growing crops contribute substantially more to GHG emissions, compared to agroecological practices, when like to like is compared. By failing to define the full complexity of the problem, GCF is failing to prioritize and emphasize the appropriate solutions, such as a focus on agroecology and centering the experiences and livelihoods of small-scale producers, as highlighted in the overarching comments.	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
1.2, 1.3	<u>References to consider and cite for shifting from high GHG emission agriculture to climate-friendly, low-GHG-emission agriculture approaches offering huge potential to simultaneously mitigate and adapt by shifting to low emission, agroecological agriculture: Integrated Solutions:the Water, Agriculture & Climate Crises, available at https://www.iatp.org/sites/default/files/2019-04/Integrated%20Solutions%20to%20Water%2C%20Agriculture%20and%20Climate%20Crises.pdf . Emission numbers for livestock sector is available at https://www.iatp.org/emissions-impossible Note: "Seven countries (U.S., EU, Canada, Argentina, Brazil, Australia, New Zealand) currently account for 43% of the world's livestock related emissions, even as they represent 15% of the world's population." They account for over 60% of the emissions when China is included.</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
1.2, 1.3	<u>The statements "Non Annex I countries produce about 75% of these global non-CO2 emissions in agriculture . Globally, countries with the most emissions are mainly those with high livestock production. Agricultural expansion leads to about 80% of deforestation emissions, constituting another 8% of global emissions." are problematic in their lack of nuance and suggestion that responsibility lies primarily with Non-Annex I countries. An equity-based approach requires countries with the highest historical per capita emissions, surplus livestock production and nutritionally high per capita consumption of meat and dairy products to take the lead. Industrialized countries that are major importers of livestock products should also account for these offshore emissions. Countries with low historical per capita emissions in agriculture and low per capita consumption of meat and dairy must not bear the burden of leading reduction efforts in the livestock sector. See IATP submission to Koronivia joint work on agriculture on Topic 2(e) at: https://www.iatp.org/documents/submission-koronivia-joint-work-agriculture-topic-2-e-improved-livestock-management</u>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
Additional References	The GCF should look at the submissions that have been made related to the Koronivia Joint Work Programme on Agriculture, especially those related to socioeconomic and food security dimensions of climate change in the agricultural sector as well as presentations made during the climate change dialogue at the end of 2020. Some have been refereced throughout and others include: Presentation of Local Communities and Indigenous Peoples Platform Facilitative Working Group to the Koronivia workshop on socioeconomic and food security dimensions of climate change in the agricultural sector: https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/7_LCIPP_Andrea_Koronivia%20December%202020.pdf ; Submission by CAN International: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/SubmissionsStaging/Documents/202011252133---CAN%20International%20Submission%20KJWA%20topic%202(f)_November%202020.pdf	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	The feedback is appreciated but goes beyond the current scope of the sector guide document.

Additional References	<p><u>The Climate, Land, Ambition, and Rights Alliance's (CLARA's) report, "Missing Pathways to 1.5C: The Role of the Land Sector in Ambitious Climate Action focuses on three areas including strengthening indigenous and community land rights (referenced above), restoring forests and other ecosystems, and transforming agriculture. The section on Transforming Agriculture takes a holistic approach to agroecology and how it will help enhance climate ambition as well as increase the resilience of food systems while reducing hunger. The report can be found here: https://www.climatelandambitionrightsalliance.org/report</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
Additional References	<p><u>The new NYDF Assessment report Balancing Forests and Development, https://forestdeclaration.org/home/balancing-forests-and-development, provides key resources and case studies – as well as discusses how funders like the GCF need to do more than just use safeguards to deal with possible negative consequences of their projects.</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
Additional References	<p><u>The recent FAO paper on Agriculture and climate change laws & governance, http://www.fao.org/policy-support/tools-and-publications/resources-details/en/c/1329952/ provides evidence and examples supporting the need to break down silos for effective climate action in the agricultural sector. As with the NYDF report above, this supports a broader understanding that is emerging that multidimensional interventions--those not laser-focused on singular measures such as farmer income, but those that consider a constellation of areas and desired impacts, across livelihoods, health and nutrition, rights and decision-making, and other dimensions--are critical to achieving and sustaining real outcomes for people.</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
Additional References	<p><u>The report "Without Feminism, There is No Agroecology," https://www.righttofoodandnutrition.org/without-feminism-there-no-agroecology, discusses the importance of taking a feminist approach to the promotion of agroecology for the realization of the right to food and securing more just and sustainable food systems.</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.

Additional References	<p><u>Action Aid's "Agroecology: scaling-up, scaling-out."</u> https://actionaid.org/publications/2018/agroecology-scaling-scaling-out,uses_evidence_to_demonstrate_how_providing_support_to_agroecology_can_help_to_achieve_the_SDGs,acheive_sustainable_agriculture,ensure_food_sovereignty,realize_the_right_to_food_and_nutrition,strengthen_women's_rights,eradicate_poverty,and_address_the_climate_crisis.It_also_provides_seven_steps_international_organizations_can_take_to_support_agroecology_on_a_large_scale.</p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
Additional References	<p><u>CIDSE study, "Finance for Agroecology: More than just a dream?" shows that the percentage of GCF funds supporting transformative agroecology were minimal representing only 10.6% of the money invested in agricultural projects by the GCF: https://www.cidse.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/CIDSE-Agroecology-and-Finance-Briefing-Sept-2020-1.pdf.</u></p>	As an individual, Women's Environment and Development Organization/GCF observer network, but this submission is a joint submission on behalf of a group of CSO and Indigenous Peoples Organizations	Feedback is well received but the feedback goes beyond the scope of the current guide.
Awknowledge ments	Suggest adding a list of abbreviations (as in the Cities, Buildings & Urban Systems sectoral guide) and/or writing out acronyms / abbreviations in full.	GCF Secretariat	A final editing will be carried out
Conclusion	This conclusion seems to intend to conclude both the guidance, the results of the implementation of proposals, and sum up the topic. This is a little confusing to the reader.	GCF Alternative BM	A final editing will be carried out to ensure smoother reading.
Conclusion	The lack of mention of "cold chains" is troubling especially if there is an opportunity to create energy-efficient and low carbon cold chains.	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond the scope of this sector. This relates more to energy efficiency.
Conclusion	food systems	GCF BM Advisor (France)	Not included
Conclusion	<p>we suggest adjusting the sentence as follows: There is broad agreement that many current food systems (...). Adding 'many' recognises that there is a problem but qualifies that this is not absolute. The proposal of measures such as this from the GCF is essentially based on the assumption that a possible pathway exists. There are ongoing efforts to specifically strengthen the sustainability of the farming sector, including in the face of the challenges posed by climate change. In Brazil, the ABC (low-carbon agriculture) Plan has shown that sustainable systems can control the sector's emissions in both agricultural production and the livestock sector, mainly by adopting integrated production systems, combined with other conservationist agriculture strategies. In addition, these systems have proven more resilient in the face of climate fluctuations and extremes. Above all, they are systems that also contribute to greater income generation and financial stability in the sector. To generalise that all food systems (which include farming systems) are not on a sustainable trajectory, is therefore to ignore the genuine efforts of countless farmers and livestock producers who are making the right decisions.</p>	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply (Brazil)	Feedback is well received but goes beyond scope of the guide.