



---

## Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10201

**Countries**

Global (Burundi, China, Colombia, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Liberia, Malaysia, Mexico, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Tanzania, Thailand, Ukraine, Vietnam)

**Project Title**

Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program

**GEF Agency(ies)**

World Bank, UNDP, IFAD, WWF-US, CI, UNIDO, IUCN, UNEP, FAO

**Agency ID**

World Bank: World Bank

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Paul Hartman

## PIF

### Part I – Project Informatics

#### Focal area elements

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

Yes, the program is aligned with elements of the GEF-7 Programming Directions.

Cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Thank you.

#### Indicative project/program description summary

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

No. The program outcomes are a fairly general mixture of outcomes and activities. Please ensure that these are as specific as possible for each component and that the language reflects an outcome and not an activity. Please also make sure to indicate more clearly where the private sector will contribute to outcomes as appropriate.

Additional, while there is some language about scale up, the focus of the outcomes is almost exclusively at the landscape/jurisdictional level. Identification and inclusion of outcomes at the national level, which creates an enabling environment that supports landscape solutions, as well as global outcomes would better align the components with the FOLUR design. Language reflecting these national and global outcomes should then be built into the narrative throughout the PFD. Specific suggestions to consider include, but should not be limited to:

For component one, an outcome on influencing national land use plans or policy on land use management, planning, etc would seem appropriate.

For component two, the outcome on convening partners, value chains, etc is an activity. Please re-write this as an outcome at the global level that would be the result of such an activity.

For component three, please revise or prepare an additional outcome on governance strengthening and institutional capacity building that includes how this will be supportive at the national level as well. Also, the outcome on 'convening partners, value chains ...' is an activity. Please re-write this as a national level outcome that is the result of such an activity. Please also consider changing the language used in Objective 3. from "Conservation & Restoration of natural habitats" to simply Restoration of Natural Habitats.

**04/30/19**

Table B has been revised to reflect outcomes for each of the components. Language demonstrating these national and global outcomes are also reflected in Table B and in the narrative sections (e.g National and Global Level Engagements sections and the description of the Theory of Change).

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

The outcome and indicator language has been refined in the PFD in line with the recommendations. See Table B.

**Agency Response: May 6-2019**

Thank you Noted,

## Co-financing

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

No.

Program Co-financing is 1:8 and investment mobilized is 1:5, both of which are consistent with the ambition of the Co-Financing policy and guidelines. The co-financing amounts presented are underpinned by the information in the associated child project concepts. From these we note that investment mobilized is low in the following countries: China, Indonesia, Liberia, Malaysia, Tanzania, Vietnam.

The co-financing table includes entities that have been misidentified as Donor Agencies instead of GEF Agencies (IUCN, the World Bank, IDB, IFAD). Please correct this.

Where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it would typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". Please correct where appropriate. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines: ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf))

With regard to the master table of co-financing sources for the program (Table C), please provide a breakdown of co-financing by entity. Each row must be an individual co-financier, not grouped together.

04/30/19

There are still a few entries that have been described as in-kind, but classified as investment mobilized. Please check and correct as appropriate.

05/07/19

Entries have been corrected.

Cleared

## Agency Response

The relevant corrections have been made. However, it is important to emphasize that there is a limit in the portal for cofinancing entries and, given the nature and scale of this program which accounts for a long list of individual cofinanciers, cofinanciers have been clustered under each category and split by type of cofinancing.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted and corrections have been made to relevant entries in Table C.

## GEF Resource Availability

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

No. Resources are within availability, but please address the following:

For the Liberia, the amount of STAR allocated from the project from FA funding is taken only from BD. As a multifocal area project, and consistent with the FOLUR design in the Programming Directions, the funding should be drawn from more than one FA. As component three of the project is focused on restoration and area to be restored is included as part of the project's core indicator results, it would seem logical to draw STAR funding from this FA as well.

04/30/19

Some updates in the uploaded PFD document and those in the Portal don't match. Please keep in mind that the numbers in the portal are the formal project numbers.

Other issues:

Liberia - only one focal area (BD) completed in the portal entry. The LOE has a minor error, with the column headings. The column labelled Fees should really be Project and the column labelled Project should be PPG.

Cote d'Ivoire- The new LOE doesn't match what is in the portal

Colombia- Check the Agency fees for the Colombia in the Portal. Does not match the LOE.

China- the portal entry does not match the LOE.

Burundi - LOE is missing

Malaysia - child project document project total does not match the LOE. It is off by \$1

When all the above have been corrected, ensure the figures also align with Annex A

Only after the LOE from Burundi is received can the amounts reflected in Table D be confirmed and cleared. Any changes to other LOEs that come in also must be reflected in this table.

05/07/19

Remaining issues have been addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

Liberia child project is now revised and reflects split by focal areas.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Liberia: Four entries for Liberia were earlier made. Owing to portal issues, they did not appear in tandem but separated within the table and hence perhaps not clear. However as per new LoE only three entries are now made for Liberia (BD, LD and Incentive),

CI, Colombia, China and Malaysia numbers are consistent in Table D and align with LoEs and Table A.

Burundi: LoE is now available and included.

### The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

Yes.

Cleared

**Agency Response** Noted. Thank you.**The focal area allocation?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

Yes.

Cleared

**Agency Response** Noted.**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

## The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

## Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

## Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

Yes.

Cleared

**Agency Response** Noted.

## **Project Preparation Grant**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

## **Core indicators**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

### **General**

Core Indicators are largely on track for Indicator 3, land restored (2.1 Mha), and Indicator 6, GHG mitigated (140m Mt Co2), but are low for land under improved practices (28 Mha). As this is the primary program indicator to capture improved practices and BD benefits, this will need to be revised. Target Beneficiaries appears reasonable at at 5M people, with a majority of these female. Targets are missing for

C&W. We understand that the program will not use GEFTF CW funds, but it would still seem appropriate to include an estimate of metric tons of chemicals eliminated or avoided as this will surely be a co-benefit of the investment activities in sustainable agriculture using both GEF investment (STAR and incentive funds) and co-financing. Please revised accordingly.

Please also address the general comments below:

1. Hectares for core indicators 1,3 and 4:

Latest at the CEO endorsement stage, it would be useful to see how these numbers were calculated. We have noticed that some child projects (e.g. Tanzania) have included the entire project area between these indicators, whereas others (e.g. Guatemala) have used hectare values for these indicators that represent a small percentage of the overall project area.

2. Alignment of indicator values:

- Hectares under 3 (restoration) and 4 (improved practices) yield CO2e benefits captured by sub-indicator 6.1. We recommendation looking at the CO2e per hectare value in different countries and check outliers (e.g. China, Cote d'Ivoire, Colombia, Ethiopia , Ghana, Indonesia). Seeing the assumptions made in the calculations and/or Ex-ACT tools would be very useful – especially for the outliers. We would be very happy to review and provide comments and suggestions for any Ex-ACT files during the PPG phase.

3. Program Level Targets –There is some mis-alignment between expected results in the PFD when you compare them against the sum of the child projects (including global child):

CI 1: PFD shows 6,231,460 whereas the sum of children is 6,921,619

CI 3: PFD shows 2,128,698 whereas the sum of children is 1,778,698 (IP target = 5,160,000)

CI 4: PFD shows 28,569,911 whereas the sum of children is 12,004,610 (IP target = 105,780,000)

CI 6: PFD shows 139,130,876 whereas the sum of children is 1,025,467,755 (IP target = 380,120,000)

## Child Projects

**Please ensure that the below are addressed no later than during the PPG phase of the country child projects:**

### Burundi

For indicator 1, this appears to be for the targeted project area within the Kibira National Park, which is adjacent to the coffee landscape, at the perimeter of the National Park. If this is Improved management, it would need to impact the METT score for the entire park (40,000 ha) and thus be outside the scope of the project.

If we compare the areas covered by SLM and restoration activities in the project (7,200 ha), and the average size of land per farmer in Burundi (#0.8 ha), we have difficulties to see how the number of target beneficiaries reaches 74,000.

### China

The total number of hectares under improved practice in the core indicators table equals 750,000 ha despite the estimate of 950,000 ha targeted in the landscapes.

The GHG estimate of 6,000,000 t CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigated seems low given the GEF investment and co-financing

While the project will not use CW funds, it would still seem appropriate to include an estimate of metric tons of chemicals eliminated or avoided as this will surely be a co-benefit of the investment activities in sustainable agriculture.

### Colombia

GHG benefits of 1 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> is too low. It would be important to better understand how the 10 Mt CO<sub>2</sub> indirect benefits are generated and ensure there are not post-direct benefits. The number of beneficiaries is quite low

### Cote d'Ivoire

GHG mitigation of 18 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e appears high but can be justified by the co-financing. A more conservative approach could be considered and at least a short explanation would be welcome (which operation in which area provide X t CO<sub>2</sub>e during X years).

### Ethiopia

For indicator 1, this appears to be for the targeted project area within the National Park. If this is Improved management, it would need to impact the METT score for the entire park and thus be outside the scope of the project.

For Indicator 3 (61,552 ha), it's possible that this value may be double-counting hectares already considered with Indicator 1. Please ensure that Indicators 1, 3, and 4 are all mutually exclusive in terms of hectares counted.

For indicator 4 (1,800,000 ha), this seems quite high and is an outlier.

For Indicator 6 (82,169,549 t CO<sub>2</sub>e), this number seems extremely high. The total hectares used here (Annex A; 4,388,400 ha + 1,434,600 ha) is not in line with the hectares reported for 1, 3 and 4 in the core indicators. In Annex A they show 2,911,500 ha for Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares) as an input for CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigation estimates. This is not in line with the value in core indicator 1. A 70% reduction in deforestation rates seems to be very ambitious. Please check your assumptions on this.

### Ghana

For indicator 1, this appears to be for the targeted project area within a National Park. If this is Improved management, it would need to impact the METT score for the entire park and thus be outside the scope of the project.

Based on the total budget of the project, the area restored of 25,000 ha appears low.

GHG mitigation benefit is quite low: we would welcome an explanation or a bit more ambition

### Guatemala

Considering the GEF and co-financing investment, the results indicated in core indicators 3 & 4 are quite low. This is especially true when the identified landscape is more than 725 thousand hectares in size. We would assume that the amount of avoided deforestation expected would be much more significant than indicated as would the area restored, even the actual target for interventions in the landscape isn't quite this large.

For indicator 6, the project will generate a GHG mitigation of 403,468 tCO<sub>2</sub>e (Indicator 6.2) outside AFOLU sector. It is unclear where this benefit comes from and this needs to be clarified. The overall GHG benefit of 832,888 is too low with regard to the investments. The concept states that this comes from restoration, but is avoided deforestation or improved agriculture practices factored in? In addition, we recommend using a 20 years period for the carbon calculation, otherwise it has to be justified. As regard to the beneficiaries, we wonder why the female are only 40%. Globally the results are low if we compare with other projects.

#### Indonesia

In the GEF 7 Core Indicator table, indicator 1 is 4,776,862 ha. As the project is not focused on working in/creating protected areas but improving productive landscapes this number is extremely high. These Hectares might be better placed under Indicator 4, particularly if some of this calculation is related to avoided loss of forest/set asides through HCVF identification and management.

The Indicator 6 GHG emission target of 888,084,958 tCO<sub>2</sub>e is more than double the entire FOLUR program target 380.12 M tCO<sub>2</sub>e. Based on the assumptions in the annexed table, the projected annual deforestation rate, e.g. in West Kalimantan (without project) is 1.37% and with project 1.2%. Please check this is a reasonable assumption to make at the landscape level.

#### Kazakhstan

For indicator 3, the target of 655,000 ha restored extremely ambitious and may not be feasible given project resources;

For indicator 4, the total number of hectares (1.1M ha) seems high given that this will be through demonstration projects

For indicator 6, even though STAR resources from CC aren't being used, an estimate should be included as it is expected that GHG mitigation will occur as a result of ha restored and improved land management.

For indicator 11 an initial estimate must be included

#### Liberia

100,000 ha are indicated being managed to benefit biodiversity. Is this reasonable in the landscape considered?

For the 50,000 ha as HCVF loss avoided is the assumption that it would be 100% deforested without this project, and that with the project there would be 0% deforestation?

Even if STAR resources from CC aren't being used, an estimate should be included as it is expected that GHG mitigation will occur as a result of avoided HCV loss, restoration and d and improved land management.

#### Malaysia

For indicator 1, it is not clear if this would be newly created PAs or improved mgmt of existing PA. If these 30,000 ha of HCV forests are under community forest management these hectares would better fit under Indicator 4.

The GHG estimate of 3,000,000 t CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigated seems low given the GEF investment and co-financing

Considering the size of the landscapes and the investment, 20,000 ha under improved practices seems an extremely conservative estimate that doesn't align well with the scope of interventions detailed in the concept narrative. In component one alone the indicator details 250,00 ha under improved management.

#### Mexico

For indicator 1, this appears to be for the targeted project area within a National Park. If this is Improved management, it would need to impact the METT score for the entire park and thus be outside the scope of the project.

The project generates a GHG mitigation of 103,739 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. It is unclear where this benefit comes from and this needs to be clarified.

#### Peru

Indicator 4.1 : 946,000ha seems a bit high given the project approach and scope ( "Implemented land use plans, enforcement and monitoring support small holders' shift to deforestation free commodities in 1 million ha") and it would be good to see a justification for these numbers.

#### Papua New Guinea

For a total target area of over 2 million ha the expected GEBs are relatively low. Please ensure the expected targets are aligned to the relevant Outcomes during the PPG stage.

#### Tanzania

For indicator 1, this appears to be for the targeted project area within the National Park. If this is Improved management, it would need to impact the METT score for the entire park and thus be outside the scope of the project.

For indicator 3 please ensure that the improved land productivity through climate-smart agriculture (75,000 ha) are counted only once in either Indicator 3 or, perhaps more appropriately, indicator 4. The Forest land restoration through SFM (50,000 ha) is focused on SLM and perhaps better captured under indicator 4. At any rate, please be sure that the hectares are not counted in both places. Wetland restoration through improved planning and practices in the rice production sector: (75,000 ha) might fit better under indicator 4.

For indicator 4: The 666,930 ha, along with the 200,000 ha in indicator 3, represents the entire targeted landscapes minus Pas, which is not reasonable to expect to be improved in its entirety by the project. Please adjust with a more realistic total. The revised amount would presumably be an input to the CO<sub>2</sub>e estimation.

#### Thailand

LD & GHG results appear low considering the STAR and co-financing investment

While the project will not use CW funds, it would still seem appropriate to include an estimate of metric tons of chemicals eliminated or avoided as this will surely be a co-benefit of the investment activities in sustainable agriculture.

#### Ukraine

Core indicator 4 is very small, if the project works in productive landscapes, why is this so low? The core indicator 1 on Protected Areas would indicate that the project might work primarily on BD issues inside of protected areas primarily and not on sustainable food systems. This is not the focus of the project and may make elements of the work not eligible for IP support.

Indicator 6 is very low, particularly when considering the focus on carbon rich peatlands

#### Vietnam

The GHG estimate of 2,000,000 t CO<sub>2</sub>e mitigated seems low given the GEF investment and co-financing

While the project will not use CW funds, it would still seem appropriate to include an estimate of metric tons of chemicals eliminated or avoided as this will surely be a co-benefit of the investment activities in sustainable agriculture./

**04/30/19**

The core indicators in the PFD do not all match with the sum of the child projects. The roll up for indicators 1,4, and 6 are different to varying degrees with the sum of the child project indicators.

The restoration target has been lowered compared with the previous submission. This is mainly due to the significant drop off for LD targets in Ethiopia, Tanzania (where the restoration target has been zeroed out), Kazakhstan and Ukraine. Please correct or justify these targets as restoration is expected to be a part of all child projects in some way.

The GHG mitigation estimates for Guatemala, Indonesia and Nigeria appear very high. Please correct or ensure that the the numbers are justified.

Kazakhstan is the only child project that doesn't have GHG mitigation target, but emissions reductions should be captured by every child project.

The GHG mitigation estimates for Burundi, Colombia, Thailand and Ukraine appear low as compared to other projects and should be checked. Please note that for Thailand, the period of calculation seems to be only 5 years while 20 years is recommended, which should be corrected

CW indicator target is missing for the PFD. It should be tracked at Program Level.

#### Other issues to be addressed in the PPG phase:

- Burundi: mistake in the total of beneficiaries in the core indicators worksheet
  - Cote d'Ivoire: number of beneficiaries in the core indicators worksheet not included
  - Ethiopia: core indicators worksheet is missing
  - Ghana: total of area land restored and of landscapes under improved practices not included in the right box of the core indicators.
- Discrepancies between total GHG mitigated and from AFOLU sector
- Guatemala: total of beneficiaries not included in the right box of the core indicators worksheet

- Indonesia: core indicators worksheet is missing
- Liberia: core indicators worksheet is missing
- Malaysia: the number of years recommended for GHG mitigation calculation is 20 years and not 30 years, unless a strong justification is provided;
- PNG: core indicators worksheet is missing
- Tanzania: the GHG mitigation is different between table p.315 (10 million Co2e) and the core indicators worksheet (19+25 million Co2e)  
The core indicators worksheet is in complete.
- Thailand: The period of calculation recommended is 20 years (and not 5), unless a strong justification is provided; the GHG mitigation is not expressed in tons in the core indicators worksheet p.370; no beneficiaries informed in the core indicators worksheet p. 373;
- Ukraine: the core indicators worksheet indicates area of new protected area created while the table of core indicators doesn't capture this.
- Vietnam: total of beneficiaries not informed in the core indicators worksheet
- Global platform Child Project: the Total area under improved management in table doesn't match with the sum of area restored and area under improved practices.

05/07/19

Restoration target has been increased sufficiently. CW target now included. Other revisions have been made as requested. Please ensure that those not yet incorporated are addressed during the PPG Phase.

Cleared

## Agency Response

Noted Thank you. Country Child Project's have been updated and revised where possible in line with recommendations. In general, it is important to emphasize that the BD related activities are in most cases focusing on the protected areas and forest reserves which are impacting the agricultural landscapes for that specific context.

As suggested, respective additional comments will be taken on board during the PPG phase and CEO endorsement stage as applicable.

On the targets for CW, it was agreed bilaterally that as relevant specific child project concepts will monitor the CW co-benefits and details will be developed at the CEO endorsement stage. These will however not be tracked at the Program level

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Revisions have been made as relevant at this stage in the core indicators table of the PFD and CP sheets (missing worksheets are now available). As recommended the numbers will be reconfirmed during the PPG stage.

Restoration target while lower than earlier submission is now upwardly revised to capture the revised estimations from the Child projects (see Table F). These number are indeed early estimates and will be revisited during the preparation phase.

As discussed bilaterally, the estimated CW target relevant to specific countries have been added, to indicate the reduction in use of chemical inputs under SLM and CSA based on FOLUR IP interventions, particularly in key target areas and crops as these are not provided in the CP Concept Notes. More precise estimates will be provided by CPs during PPG stage. The current estimate is based on estimated reduction in use of chemicals in rice production in China (targeting a portion of 1.2 m ha, assume a quarter), Thailand (1.65 m ha) and Vietnam (110,000 ha).

## Project/Program taxonomy

### 7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the program is properly tagged with appropriate key words.

Cleared

Agency Response Noted. Thank you.

## Part II – Project Justification

### 1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

No

The PFD project document would benefit from general improvements in terms of analysis, structuring and logical flow of the approach. Information should be consolidated in the appropriate sections as opposed to spread out across them. In general, it does not come out strongly (in the context, baseline, or alternative scenario) that the program is targeting different types of landscapes/contexts (eg. deforestation free commodity supply chains, food crops and livestock causing significant environmental degradation, frontier landscapes, and restoration landscape).

There is a lot of useful and informative context in the Problem, Root Causes, Barriers section but the information needs to be organized in sub-headings. Generally, we would expect to see environmental, food production, socio-economic data and analysis on the different categories of landscapes being targeted, then the related problems, root causes and barriers related to these production landscapes at the national, jurisdictional and global level. Please revise.

04/30/19

Overall, the document is much improved. Comments related to the root causes and barriers section have been sufficiently addressed.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

PFD has been revised as suggested. Discussion of targeting the landscapes and commodity/food systems is included in section 7. Analytical information has been supplemented in Sections 1 and 2.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

No.

We would expect to see a description of what the situation currently looks like in the targeted commodities landscapes (eg. coffee, cocoa, palm, rice wheat, etc). Some of this is captured in the excellent 'challenges and opportunities' boxes, but this section also needs to include information on significant initiatives, investments and capacities on which the impact program and its child projects will build, as described below:

Significant baseline investments and initiatives should be identified in key target landscapes that support of improving sustainable production systems, strengthening of value chains.

Multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms and knowledge hubs at regional and global levels in which the countries participate should be identified (NYDF, TFA, EAT Lancet, etc). These are crucial in supporting existing communities of practice and allowing the knowledge generated through the child projects to be channeled and to contribute to global knowledge resources on the effectiveness of FOLUR strategies, and will provide an important basis for inter-country collaboration, avoiding (or reducing) the need for the program to establish new mechanisms.

There is some information on policy and institution reforms taking place but key development policies, strategies and plans that make provision for sustainable agricultural production and environmental protection should be further highlighted.

04/30/19

The Baseline Scenario section is still missing information on related projects/programs/initiatives that are ongoing or have ended.

05/07/19

A table has been included to highlight relevant projects, programs and initiatives. In the PPG phase, please indicate the investment level of these initiatives and identify other key interventions relevant to targeted commodities and countries, including GEF projects.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

The appropriate sections have been strengthened. A more complete annex E on additional multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms has been added to better clarify.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Revisions have been made in line with recommendations to align with the baseline initiatives presented in the GEF programming directions (Table 5 of the PFD). These are included in the stakeholder section of the PFD.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

No. The alternative scenario provides a detailed list of strategies, but doesn't describe the expected outcomes and components of the program. A diagram of Theory of Change is presented, but an explanation of how this will achieve program outcomes is missing. Also missing is a rationale for the "programmatic approach," which is the basis for catalyzing the transformational shift we seek through the impact program. While the support to countries is very well articulated throughout the document, it is not clear why such support cannot be provided in isolation as opposed to a program approach. The PFD should include explicit statements about why the environmental challenges posed by food systems and land use can only be overcome through a holistic and systems approach across multiple scales – from local, national and global scale. The baseline scenario argues for this but the alternative scenario does not clarify how the IP will address this need to catalyze transformational shift through actions on the ground (priority landscapes / jurisdictions), across countries and regions, and globally (platform). It could be improved by indicating the transformational vision, and how through these different landscapes and value chains we can get there, also taking into the account the layered impact at the national jurisdictional and global level.

The alternative scenario also indicates that the crops of focus exist in hierarchy of deforestation commodities over food crops, which is not an accurate reflection of the design. The five commodities (oil palm, soy, beef, cocoa and coffee) driving deforestation, and the three major food crops (rice, wheat and maize) plus livestock that are generating significant negative externalities are all viewed as of equal focus in the FOLUR design. Please revise.

In some areas the narrative regarding interventions along the entire value chain and corresponding actors could also be strengthened as there is heavier emphasis on the producer level and the actors at this level.

04/30/19

The response has incorporated most of the suggested comments (eg. vision with a brief summary of the theory of change). Further clarification on the how the strategies fit into the ToC would be helpful. Are they aligned with specific components or do they cut across components?

Please call out more specifically the important role that comprehensive land use planning in integrated land management.

The project components outlined in Section 5 should be included with further details in the Alternative Scenario section. In addition to additional information on the proposed activities, expected outcomes and the linkages with the countries selected should also be included.

05/07/19

A clearer explanation of the Theory of Change diagram has been included. The importance of comprehensive land use planning as a key part of integrated land management has been highlighted. Other comments have been sufficiently addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

Programmatic approach is discussed in Section 3, including focus at national and global level. Balance improved between commodities and food crops plus livestock. Emphasis on value chain interventions at global level through the platform partners is integrated with the discussion of roles and capacities of platform partners under Section 6 on Coordination, and other relevant sections of the PFD.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Discussion of the ToC has been extended with reference to program structure and components. As recommended content has been realigned and moved from Section 5 to better introduce the program and its parts before discussing the TOC. As designed the IP is comprised of global partnerships, a knowledge to action platform, and country level project linked up as illustrated in Figure 1, to advance substantially beyond ongoing efforts to achieve sustainability, meet global commitments and deliver global environmental benefits. In addition, the role of comprehensive planning is better emphasized.

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

No. The description of the alignment of the Program with GEF-7 FA/IP strategy is in need of further development.

As currently written, the benefits that would be generated from the program still appear to be from a collection of countries not the totality of their impact in shifting the food system as a result of Program support. The PFD would benefit from organizing the narrative around commodities and landscapes targeted for transformational change, which would be a good way to weave the story from a programmatic perspective, so that countries become more clearly reflected as key elements of the systems shift. One way to address this is by using information already provided in the Text Boxes and then clarifying how the various countries will fit into and contribute to the solutions space (both horizontal and vertical dimensions). This is the bottom-up aspect should extend from target landscapes / jurisdiction in the countries through to global supply chains.

The rationale for a global platform is lacking, and the PFD seems to reduce this component to “collaboration and coordination.” This is not very different from BAU with previous programmatic approaches and is not in line with the GEF ambition to build coalitions that will move the needle on these big challenges. While the case is made throughout for engaging diverse stakeholders and key actors, the PFD does not clarify how the global platform itself will influence and catalyze transformational shift. One is left wondering if the committed funds will simply go toward fragmented (albeit coordinated) activities that do not collectively add to much for driving systems change. This needs to be addressed, especially in section 5 on Incremental reasoning for Component 4.

**04/30/19**

The programmatic perspective has been strengthened throughout the document. The response has incorporated the suggested comments.

The commodities and landscapes targeted for transformational change are now well described in section 7 on innovation, sustainability and scaling. Given the importance of this framing, the PFD would benefit from having elements of this description built into the narrative earlier in the document. This could include in sections 3 on the alternative scenario and 4 to demonstrate consistency with the IP strategy.

The rationale for the platform has been better justified. A targeted identification of specific gaps/needs that the platform would help overcome in order to contribute to transformation of the food system would strengthen this rationale further.

**05/07/19**

An good summary of the targeted landscapes and how they cut across commodities and countries is now part of the program overview in section 3. A table on how the FOLUR global platform will address gaps is included.

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

The context for Programmatic approach has been strengthened Section 3, including rationale for the platform and CPs working together toward larger goals. As designed, FOLUR's programmatic approach is emphasizes that the environmental and sustainability challenges associated with food and commodity production systems require an integrated and multi-level approach working across local, national and global scale. Achieving this transition will require a holistic, system-wide approach integrating both horizontal (land and natural resources) and vertical (food value and supply chain) dimensions, facilitated through a coordination glue project.

Section 5 further details the structure of the program and components at Child project and Platform level. Areas of intervention at platform level are further detailed in section 5 and in section 6 on Coordination, where partner roles and interventions are described.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

As recommended summarized information on Child projects target landscapes from Section 7 has been added to section 3 of the PFD. In addition, a table of specific gaps and responses has been included to section 3 of the PFD, which emphasizes upon gaps in planning, knowledge, policies and incentives, scale of action, financing, and collaboration among institutions and land users, aligned with the key interventions and components as illustrated in the ToC.

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

The description of the value add of the program and global platform in the incremental reasoning section is strong but requires further details on 'how' this will be brought to fruition. This needs to be detailed to a greater extent.

04/30/19

Additional details have been included on the role of the platform and how the project intends to use it to influence and catalyze a shift in the system. We expect that the specific activities and responsibilities of coalition partners will be further developed during PPG phase.

Cleared

### Agency Response

The incremental reasoning (section 5) for the project has been strengthened to provide more detailed information in support of the added value of the GEF financing for this program and the leveraging potential of the interventions both at the country and global levels through collaborative partnerships. The specific activities and responsibilities of coalition partners will be further developed during PPG phase.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

Yes. The targets are reasonable and achievable. However, as mentioned above, some general issues need to be addressed with regard to the program indicators.

**04/30/19**

Please address the issues identified for the core indicators in the box on Table F above.

05/07/19

Requested revisions have been made.

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

Language on outcomes and indicators revised as suggested. See earlier response as well.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

The core indicator issues have been resolved in Table F, and also CW target has been included. Updates based on revised child projects are consolidated and captured in the PFD.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

No. The sustainability section needs to be strengthened as it does not indicate what mechanisms are being put in place to facilitate continuity of the results.

Moreover, the country project descriptions are organized country by country, while the program is intended to overcoming the risks of working in geographic silos and not learning from or inspiring each other. The innovations and progress of the program are not supposed to be held locally but contribute to a critical mass that contributes to shifting food systems. To better reflect this, we suggest clustering of the projects by commodity or landscape (eg. West Africa cocoa landscapes, Rice Landscapes, etc).

**04/30/19**

The response has incorporated the suggested comments. However, the term 'innovation' is used throughout the PFD and seems to mean different things in different sections. Please ensure that the primary ways that innovation is being sought is clearly defined and that the term is used consistently and narrowly. In some places in the narrative it may be better to substitute a different term.

**05/07/19**

Sufficiently addressed remaining comment on the use of the term innovation throughout the document.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

Sustainability section has been improved with a discussion of how and where the Program and Child projects will work with important commodity and food system landscapes.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Narrative has been better clarified in the PFD re the context of innovation and revised as relevant to the context. In general it may be pointed out that indeed innovation should be interpreted in the specific context used in this document, and is intended to convey the introduction or application of new or modified approaches, practices, or techniques/technologies that provide effective solutions to overcome existing constraints in achieving the Program or Child Project objectives.

### **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

A map has been included that geo-references the intended target landscapes for implementation through child projects. However, it would be more helpful if the main crops of focus are identified for each country as opposed to the lead agency that will be responsible for undertaking the work.

04/30/19

The map is sufficient. Please work to revise the map further during the PPG phase.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

As above, more detailed information on the landscapes and regions where the program will work is included in the narrative text. While the map has been revised to illustrate the relevant food systems, at a later stage during PPG a more informative and illustrative map of the priority crops and landscapes will be developed.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you. A revised version of the map in line with the Banks policy is now included in the PFD – it captures the same elements as before.

**Stakeholders**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

Yes. At this stage the information provided regarding Stakeholder Engagement is acceptable. However, given the nature of the Program, stakeholder consultations are key to guaranteeing the effective participation and transparency as well as improved governance. It's best practice to start the consultations early in the process. These processes should be reinforced during the PPG stage, particularly with those stakeholders that will be key parts of or affected by the program and those who have a special interest, including CSOs, communities, indigenous peoples, private sector and local governments and agencies.

Information on how Stakeholders will be engaged in the Program and means of engagement throughout the Program cycle: There are several outcomes and targets that include stakeholder engagement. Means of engagement have been specified throughout the Program cycle. A list of potential key stakeholders has been provided.

Going forward, for more information on the requirements at CEO Endorsement phase, the Agency is advised to please check the approved [Policy on Stakeholder Engagement](#) as well as the corresponding [Guidelines](#).

Cleared

### Agency Response

Stakeholder engagement and consultations will be continued during the PPG stage.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you.

### Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

No.

While the PFD identifies entry points and opportunities for FOLUR to address relevant gender gaps, the information is very general and not connected to the context and ambition of FOLUR. Gender considerations should be mainstreamed into the four FOLUR components, outcomes and indicators. Please provide more details on gender dimensions linked to the project context. This could include a reference in the description of the baseline scenario on the increasing number of commitments and initiatives aimed at promoting gender equality linked to the food value chain, or information related to challenges and opportunities smallholder farmers face e.g. gender dimension linked to cocoa, coffee, and rice value chains and the need to support and enable women's contribution to the productivity, quality and sustainability of these chains. Finally, in the section on gender the opportunities outlined to include women in the design and implementation are very general and, while directly relevant to GEF's new gender tags, they are not efficiently linked to the objective, components and general framework of the IP.

The global platform child project is also lacking in its considerations on gender. It is important that the coordination project includes indicative plans on gender in components such capacity strengthening and policy and the global knowledge platform. The global child project mentions the preparation of a FOLUR gender strategy, but the PFD doesn't reference this. The PFD should indicate that during the PPG phase a program level FOLUR gender strategy or action plan will be developed to make the gender mainstreaming efforts more explicitly visible during implementation and in the collaboration with the child projects.

**04/30/19**

We expect that the articulation of the gender context will be further developed during PPG phase.

Cleared

### **Agency Response**

The context for gender has been better clarified and enhanced in the both the PFD and Global Platform child project. It may further be emphasized that concrete actions and outputs relating to gender as relevant in the child projects will be developed during the project preparation phase.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you..

### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

No. While the private sector is mentioned often, the description of how the private sector will be engaged in the Program remains quite vague. It is not clear how the multinationals, national companies and platforms will be stimulated to expand their commitments to other commodities and geographies. Will this only rely on policy changes? In section 2 on stakeholders, the text doesn't clearly explain how the private sector will be engaged in the program preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement. In section 4 on private section engagement, important and relevant elements are provided such as the targeted stakeholders, the areas of intervention, the objectives to meet, the promotion of private and green financing (which should be built upon), the policy enhancement and the improved agricultural practices on the ground. Nevertheless, we don't see clearly how this will be achieved. More detailed and engaging actions of and with the private sector are requested. Please indicate what the private sector co-financing be used for more concretely.

The critically important role of the global platform's engagement with private sector and financial actors across the supply chain is largely missing. The rational of the importance of the vertical aspects of the FOLUR design and the linkages of each of these steps through the supply chain approach are not well defined. These need to be included to strengthen the understanding of how the platform will add value to the individual child projects vis-à-vis global engagement of the private sector and financing institutions.

Please revise accordingly.

04/30/19

Greater details on how private sector will be engages are provided throughout the PFD. Specific identification of some of the companies and financial institutions that will be targeted for engagement would be clarifying, particularly in the section that describes the child projects

We also don't see the response to our comment in section 2/Stakeholders on how the private sector will be engaged in the program preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement. Please respond.

It's not clear in Figure 4 on the global platform what the column on the right means (especially with private sector and private finance) and how it relates with the graphic on the left. A heading might be helpful here.

05/07/19

Comments have been addressed, including how private sector will be engaged in program preparation during the PPG phase. The additional heading in Figure 4 is clarifying. Some identification of specific private sector companies and financing institutions to be targeted has been included. We expect that this will be further defined and elucidated during the PPG phase.

Cleared

## Agency Response

By further detailing the programmatic approach in Section 3 and the roles of partner coalitions in Section 5, the engagement with private sector at national and international levels has been strengthened and clarified. The section on Coordination (6) further clarifies how the platform partners will build on and expand engagements with private companies, buyers, producers and trade associations, as well as financial institutions

Agency Response: May 6-2019

As recommended, more specific information has been added to emphasize the private sector engagement discussion in the PFD. Figure 4 has been improved to clarify the linkage between. In addition an approach for consulting the private sector during PPG phase has been included..

## Risks

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/19

The PFD identifies a number of risks and mitigation strategies for these in sufficient detail. However, potential climate change risks are currently not considered and should be included in this section. Efforts to address risks at the program and project levels should be undertaken during the PPG phase.

04/30/19

Cleared

**Agency Response**

Noted. Additional risk of climate change and mitigation strategy discussed and included in the PFD.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you.

**Coordination**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

No.

A stronger explanation of the global platform needs to be included in the PFD proper as much of It is currently only mentioned in the Annexes. For example, the baseline section of the PFD does not describe existing platforms or institutional frameworks that may be engaged in similar work, and the Incremental Reasoning section of the PFD should already begin to detail the Global Knowledge to Action Platform and the value added of this approach.

The description of the role FOLUR core partners are global coalitions will play in achieving strategic value and impact is too vague. These partners (Food and Land Use Coalition, Food and Agriculture Organization, Good Growth Partnership, and the Global Landscape Forum) are listed by name but how they will each specifically contribute to the outcomes of the program and platform is not captured, nor are the strengths of the World Bank in engaging with financial sector regulators and generating financing. Instead it broadly states that FOLUR core partners will be "jointly learning, leveraging and spreading FOLUR results through established networks to scale up, mainstream, and incentivize improved landscape and supply chain practices." This needs to be made more specific with the relevant strengths and comparative advantages of each better detailed and an explanation of how these will be brought to bear in the implementation of the platform.

04/30/19

The response has incorporated most of the suggested comments. Additional information should be included in the baseline on existing platforms or institutional frameworks that may be engaged in similar work.

As described, the Global Platform will be coordinating with and working through other multi-stakeholder initiatives (eg. FOLU, GLF, GGP) as core and resource partners, however, in some cases an agency or NGO is listed as the entity through which the platform will engage (eg. FAO, IDH, etc). Please ensure that there is consistency in the description of the types entities with which the platform will engage. From our understanding of the role of the platform these should all be multistakeholder groups.

05/07/19

The table included on global initiatives is clarifying in understanding the baseline upon which the program will build. The role of the FAO has been better explained vis-a-vis other multistakeholder groups identified. We expect that during the PPG phase a further identification of and outreach to specific multi-stakeholder initiatives that FAO is leading or contributing to will be undertaken.

Cleared.

### Agency Response

The role FOLUR core partners and global coalitions has been further specified both in section 5 and in section 6 on coordination, including their strengths and comparative advantages and how these will be deployed through specific activities (which will be further defined and budgeted during PPG phase). Also refer to Annex E of the PFD.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

It may be clarified that FOLUR is designed to work through the platform lead agencies to access specific partner organizations and information in that context is now better clarified in the coordination section. The context of the role of FAO as a coalition of countries with a special role as a UN agency, not an NGO or a platform has been made. A table of global collaborations and initiatives relevant to FOLUR has also been included in the PFD (Table 5), based on the IP Programming Guidance..

### Consistency with National Priorities

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

Yes. The consistency with national strategies has been already been outlined and was one of the selection criteria for countries during the Expression of Interest.

Cleared

**Agency Response** Noted. Thank you.

**Knowledge Management**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

04/22/19

Overall, the proposal treats knowledge management, knowledge exchange and learning fairly adequately and appropriately at this early concept/design stage, but it is not fully described in the KM section but instead across the document as a whole. Revisions to strengthen the KM section of the PFD and tie everything together, especially with respect to how the FOLUR will link with child projects in practice and facilitate knowledge flow across the partnership and beyond, to benefit the child projects and vice versa, are requested.

Currently, several existing Knowledge hubs/platforms are mentioned in the proposal and it is suggested that the these could be linked to create a larger “community of practice”. By the time of CEO endorsement, it would be helpful to have a brief description of how each platform already functions and how FOLUR would build on them to create a more comprehensive/effective community of practice.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please include plans for a more strategic approach to communications that connects communication of information and knowledge to supporting capacity building, stakeholder engagement, advocacy and policy change.

By the time of CEO endorsement for the child projects, please provide more details regarding KM actions/arrangements/deliverables proposed at the child project level.

04/30/19

Cleared

### Agency Response

The current PFD includes more information on KM and the roles of coalition partners in developing specific KM approaches and products. The roles and functions of the existing platform partners are described in Annex B of the Global Platform Project. How the platform project will use strategic communication approaches to support capacity building, stakeholder engagement, advocacy and policy change has been strengthened and will be further developed and specified during PPG phase.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Noted. Thank you.

### art III – Country Endorsements

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- 04/22/19
- No. Copies of OFP endorsement letters for the following countries are missing:
- Burundi
- China
- Cote d'Ivoire (*date was provided so this may just be an omission logging in the document*)

04/30/19

LOE for Burundi is still missing.

05/07/19

All of the LOEs have now been uploaded.

Cleared

### Agency Response

Letters of Endorsement have since been received for China and Cote d'Ivoire, and are now attached with the resubmission package. LoE for Burundi is expected By May 1<sup>st</sup> and will be submitted upon receipt.

Agency Response: May 6-2019

Letter of endorsement for Burundi is available and attached to the submission.

### EFSEC DECISION

### RECOMMENDATION

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**05/07/19**

Yes, the PFD is recommended for technical clearance.

**OBJECTIVE AND KEY INTERVENTIONS:** The "Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program" seeks to promote a transformational shift in agricultural land use and food systems that are major drivers of environmental degradation around the world. The FOLUR IP PFD is structured according to four main components: 1. Development of Integrated Landscape Management Systems; 2. Promotion of sustainable food production practices & responsible commodity value chains; 3. Restoration of natural habitats; and 4. Program Coordination, Collaboration, and Capacity Building. This design aims to promote comprehensive land planning, improve governance and align incentives, scale up innovation and practical applications in commodity value chain partnerships, leverage

investments through linkage with private and public partners, and promote institutional collaboration in integrated approaches at country and landscape level. The amount of GEF resources requested to implement the FOLUR Global Program and Child Projects is \$213,268,554. This GEF financing is estimated to leverage nearly \$1.75 trillion in co-financing.

Given the environmental footprint of the food system – directly and through induced land use change (e.g., deforestation, natural landscape degradation, GHG emissions, water depletion, chemical pollution) – the spatial distribution of FOLUR seeks to cover globally important geographies for both the commercial agricultural commodities (e.g., soybeans, coffee, cocoa, palm oil and livestock) and food staples (e.g., rice, wheat and maize). The FOLUR PFD includes an initial cohort of 18 countries that have been selected based on their demonstration of strong alignment with the program vision and their high potential to generate Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) through investments in promoting transformational change. The countries are: China, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Peru, Ukraine, Vietnam, Kazakhstan, Liberia, Burundi, Colombia, Ghana, Guatemala, Mexico, PNG, Tanzania, Thailand. The IP will benefit participating countries by helping them to reconcile competing social, economic, and environmental objectives of land management, and move away from unsustainable sectoral approaches. Specifically, the GEF support will help countries meet the growing demand for increased crop and livestock production, while reducing the risk of further expansion of farmland, erosion of genetic diversity, over-exploitation of land and water resources, overuse of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, and inefficient practices that lead to deforestation, biodiversity loss, land degradation, and greenhouse gas emissions.

**CONTEXT, BASELINE, INCREMENTAL REASONING:** GEF's Programming Directions describes the challenging need for a significant transformation of global food and land use systems so that production areas integrated within larger landscapes continue to produce ecosystem services and maintain valuable natural capital that contributes to both local and global environmental benefits. While there is emerging evidence of integrated landscape management being adopted in several countries for both food security and ecosystem services, efforts are still not at scale. Achieving this transition will require a holistic, system-wide approach integrating both horizontal (land and natural resources) and vertical (food value and supply chain) dimensions. Land degradation, declining agricultural productivity, malnutrition and rural poverty are interrelated problems that require a systems-level approach to planning, management, monitoring and decision making.

Most countries have committed to achieving sustainability and resilience, in line with their national development strategies, NAPs (UNCCD), NBSAPs (CBD), and National Communications and NAPAs (UNFCCC). These commitments and frameworks signal that countries and international organizations recognize the key issues and threats to the global environment generated through unsustainable food systems. These global commitments provide a common framework for action toward larger global goals. Thus, there are considerable partnerships and initiatives going forward and momentum is building, if slowly. All this positive movement confirms that the timing is right for additional, more coordinated, scaled up action. However, there is often a gap between commitments and the resources needed to deliver on these.

The major commodity/food crops that are important for achieving the FOLUR outcomes at scale are well represented in the initial cohort of countries and landscapes, and more will be encouraged to join in a subsequent round. While each individual project will deliver substantial benefits in its own right, the program's overall potential for global transformation and sustainability will be realized by ensuring that the impact is significantly larger than the benefits aggregated across individual child projects. This will be achieved through scaling up the best practices in value / supply chains for the major food crops and agricultural commodities, influencing markets to increased share of sustainably produced food crops and agricultural commodities, and influencing policy makers, financiers and private value chain actors to adopt policies, governance structures and practices that are demonstrably environmentally sustainable.

**GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT BENEFITS:** The FOLUR IP will improve the management effectiveness of nearly 40 million hectares of production landscapes. Approximately 1.8 million hectares will be restored for the ecosystem values they provide to these landscapes, and 1.2 million hectares of protected areas adjoining these production landscapes and containing important forest, biodiversity and carbon values will be better managed. Improved agricultural practices, particularly in rice landscapes, will generate 156 thousand metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced. All these activities will result in GHG emissions reductions of nearly 210 million tCO<sub>2</sub>. The FOLUR IP will target support to 5 million direct beneficiaries, with 50% being female.

**PARTNERSHIPS:** The World Bank is the lead agency of the FOLUR IP and it brings with it convening power, high level country engagements, financing potential, global knowledge and long experience addressing cross-sectoral, multi-dimensional sustainable development challenges. The FOLUR Global Platform will create the venue for partner coalitions to jointly assess opportunities, prioritize interventions, and deploy the comparative advantage and expertise of the core partners to address key challenges, whether at landscape, country, or global level. This commitment to promote holistic, integrated, and system-wide approaches in programming draws on experiences with the Good Growth Partnership Platform (GGP), which has brought together key stakeholders involved with the major agricultural commodities that drive deforestation. The IP will build a global coalition that engages key stakeholders in the major food systems and supply chains, including existing food and forestry platforms of the FAO, the Food and Land Use coalition (FOLU), the GGP, Global Landscape Forum (GLF), Tropical Forest Alliance (TFA), Consumer Goods Forum, Bonn Challenge and others, to work collectively with countries toward achieving sustainability.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/22/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/7/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		