

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10576

Countries

Global (Guinea, Nicaragua, Uzbekistan, Kenya)

Project Name

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

Agencies

World Bank, FAO

Date received by PM

3/24/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Paul Hartman

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

April 15, 2020: Responses are provided in this section as the template does not allow for any agency feedback in the last box below.

Table B

- Component 2: the outcome ‘Partners, value chain actors, financiers and investors regularly convened, motivated and influenced to promote innovation, replication & scale up’ should be separated from the previous one (as it is in the original PFD).

April 15, 2020 Response: Revised

- For component 4 “Program Coordination, Collaboration, and Capacity Building,” please confirm that no additional financing above what has been approved in the original PFD submission is being directed to the Global Platform Child Project. -

April 15, 2020 Response: As mentioned already in the main addendum context para of the PFD, no additional resources are requested for the Global Coordination project.

Core indicators

-Core indicators need to be revised as they are not consistent with the country concepts. Please also check to ensure that there hasn’t been any double counting between Indicator 1, Indicator 3, and indicator 4.

-Core indicator 1- Please make sure that the 683,549ha listed under indicator 1 is attributed correctly. As the focus of the FOLUR program is to work in landscapes outside of protected areas, most of the targeted landscapes where improved practices are being sought should fall under core indicator 4, which excludes protected areas.

-Core indicator 3: the 10M hectares estimate does not look realistic considering that this is larger than the GEF-7 overall target. Please revise accordingly.

-Core indicator 9: Please indicate if there is any reduction of chemical inputs.

-Core indicator 11: the number of beneficiaries is low: 45,000 as compared to 2M in the PFD addendum 2 and 7M in the PFD. Please revise to better reflect a more accurate estimate.

April 15, 2020 Response: Revisions have been made based on the revised child project concepts received from FAO. Reduction in chemical use targets are not changed with the addition of these new countries. Therefore no targets are included, as this PFD addendum does not present the cumulative numbers.

New Countries and Regions

-In the table of countries, commodities and titles, please demonstrate how these new countries fit within in existing main commodity landscapes by indicating the main entry point crop only, eg. Guinea=Palm, Kenya=Coffee, Nicaragua=both Cocoa & Livestock are okay, Uzbekistan=Wheat - .

April 15, 2020 Response: Context has been revised.

Contribution of the new Child Projects to the Program's objective and results

- Please explain how each of these countries adds to the exiting portfolio. For example, it might be mentioned that Uzbekistan is a wheat producer and this add to this scale and scope of this commodity in the FOLUR portfolio; Guinea is a frontier palm country and a transboundary landscape with Liberia; Kenya is in the coffee landscape in East Africa and a transboundary landscape with Uganda; and Nicaragua is part of a mixed crop landscape (Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, Colombia) in LAC, etc.

April 15, 2020 Response: Context has been revised.

- Please include more specific information on private sector engagement related to the additional countries. .

April 15, 2020 Response: Context has been revised. Please also refer to revised child projects for further details.

Guinea

- Please mention how the project will work at the policy level on land concessioning, HCV & HCS national harmonization, etc., all of which are of primary importance in frontier landscapes. The transboundary nature of the landscape with Liberia should also be referenced. -

April 15, 2020 Response: Context has been revised.

Kenya

- Please place greater emphasis on the transboundary nature of the landscape with Uganda as this is a unique feature.- .

April 15, 2020 Response: Context has been revised.

Uzbekistan

- Important to reference planned coordination with Kazakhstan, a country Uzbek borders that is also part of the FOLUR program and focusing on wheat. -

April 15, 2020 Response: Context has been revised.

-

Alignment with national Priorities

-For Kenya the “TBC” should be taken out of the description

April 15, 2020 Response: Revised.

Revised GEF-7 Financing

- Remove the last line: ‘This includes Kenya.

April 15, 2020 Response: Revised.

FOLUR COUNTRY CONCEPTS - responses below

Guinea: Integrated management of degraded landscapes for sustainable food systems and livelihoods in Guinea Forest Region and Upper Guinea

FAO Response:

1. Additional text was added to the concept note – see highlighted additions in the context section.
2. Additional text added in the context section of the concept note – please see in yellow.
3. See highlighted text in both context section and sub section b) on baseline investments (SOGUIPAH) and stakeholder engagement.
4. We understand the concern about the targets. At the same time we have to take care not to overestimate what could realistically be delivered by the project. At this stage, we would like to remain realistic and conservative, and further define/adjust targets during PPG based on a detailed site analysis. The estimations were made taking into consideration only GEF funding and based on the restoration costs per hectare in similar geographies, made for child projects under a similar GEF 6 thematic program (TRI).
5. Additional text was added to the concept note – see concept note section c) in yellow.
6. The project intends to engage with a number of regional and global sustainable palm oil platforms, as identified in the Engagement with the Global / Regional Framework, however, engagement mechanisms will be discussed and defined during PPG. It has been impossible during this concept note phase to reach out to the Liberia team to discuss South – South cooperation plans on how to coordinate actions.

Please refer to child project matrix of responses included in the package for detailed responses.

Uzbekistan: Food System, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program in Uzbekistan

FAO Response:

1. We note that the question has been raised in the previous round. This was our answer: “The indicator is “Area of wetlands (including estuaries, mangroves) restored”. As mentioned in the PIF, there are wetlands in the proximity to the wheat landscapes. Nevertheless, the indicator has been revised and now targets 100% of agricultural land. The PPG will further consider the indicator break down by land use type and calculations will be resubmitted at the CEO Endorsement stage.”
2. We note that the question has been raised in the previous round. This was our answer: “Detailed studies with quantifiable data for Uzbekistan are not available. Nevertheless, the international consensus present in ad hoc studies suggest that wheat growing and value chains require substantial transformation due to the high environmental footprint.”
3. We note that the question has been raised in the previous round. This was our answer: “By sustainable wheat farming implies zero tillage (or reduced tillage) cultivation combined with integrated nutrient, water and pest management. Zero tillage helps preserve soil resources and reduces land degradation, especially if appropriate rotations of low-stubble crops and high-stubble crops are used. There is widespread experience with zero tillage adoption around the world which FAO

will draw upon and share with Uzbekistan. Zero tillage is much more profitable than conventional agriculture that even in the absence of explicit incentives from the government it is likely to be adopted rapidly. Currently there are no incentives for sustainable wheat farming, and the appropriate structure following globally available best practices will be studied under the PPG and proposed for project implementation.”

4. We note that the question has been raised in the previous round. This was our answer: “Good practices and lessons learnt from the project will feed into the global FOLUR platform, while tools, methods, and expertise will be drawn from the global FOLUR platform to enhance project implementation. The global FOLUR platform will critically serve to leverage South-South cooperation with other FOLUR beneficiary countries, specifically Kazakhstan and potentially others. Coordination and engagement mechanisms with other FOLUR national child projects (potentially India) focused on wheat will be detailed at PPG stage following consultations with other FOLUR partners and beneficiary countries.”

The project will engage with global, regional and national networks, platforms and initiatives of relevance to share experiences and allow for cooperation and networking among peers, awareness raising and ultimately upscaling.

A number of tools and approaches will be used to foster learning, knowledge exchange and cooperation among practitioners. At landscape level, the project will use proven methods for participation and engagement of local stakeholders, such as the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) to develop integrated landscape management plans. The project will also rely on participatory, people-centered methods for learning, e.g. Farmer Field Schools (FFS), and for disseminating information, e.g. Wheat Clusters. More classic approaches, like exchange visits, will be used to strengthen linkages with ongoing efforts (in particular baseline projects) and to highlight past successes. Lessons learnt from local implementation will be institutionalized in the departmental planning processes, and will feed into the national cross-sectoral platform for FOLUR and into the above mentioned regional and global online Communities of Practice, that will uptake and further disseminate within their own countries the fruits of those exchanges.

5. GEF incremental reasoning was added to the description of the components in the outline of the alternative scenario. Component 4 GEF increment added. The summary is as follows:

Component 1 GEF financing will go towards strengthening national legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks, incentives, and improved land use practices for ILM in line with LDN principles and climate-smart, environmentally sound wheat production and sustainable food systems that bring together multiple government, private sector and local stakeholders at landscape level to support planning for more balanced sustainable wheat landscapes and value chains to enhance delivery of global environmental benefits and sustainable livelihoods.

Component 2 GEF financing will go towards scaling-up sustainable food production on irrigated and rain-fed, wheat dominated productive landscapes (conservation agriculture, integrated soil nutrient management, improved wheat cultivars, subsurface drip irrigation system, integrated pest management, etc.). It will also go towards diversifying production systems (crop rotation and inter-cropping, improved wheat germplasm) through application of agreed local, national and international best practices via a mix of proven participatory approaches such as FFS and enabling wheat value chain actors to enhance sustainable value chains and products, with

significantly reduced environmental impacts. GEF funding will also go towards enabling smallholder farmers, both women and men, to access incentives for sustainable

wheat production practices and alternatives to intensive wheat monoculture including diversification with other crops for integrated systems to mainstream biodiversity, increase land restoration, and reduce environmental pollution. Cooperative platforms for wheat value chain actors focusing on sustainable wheat production, marketing, and sale will be developed to enhance the delivery of GEBs. The work under this component will be done following FAO experiences on sustainable wheat production “Save and Grow in practice: maize, rice, wheat” and in line with the principles laid out in the “Voluntary guidelines on sustainable Soil management”, “International Code of Conduct for the Sustainable Use and Management of Fertilizers”, and “Principles for Responsible Investment in Agriculture and Food Systems”.

Component 3 GEF financing will go towards supporting high nature value ecosystem/habitat restoration for GEB and enhanced ecosystem services to support agriculture in an equitable manner.

Component 4 GEF financing will go towards supporting standardized indicators introduced linking to the FOLUR IP; A national experience exchange network on sustainable food production established at the Ministry of Agriculture and linked to the Kazakhstan FOLUR IP exchange network; RBM Gender-Sensitive system of the project promoted adaptive management through capturing key results of the project activities and peer-to-peer training; Communication Strategy and KM strategy; Project Mid-term review and Final Evaluation; and finally Global IP platform engagement & coordination

Please also refer to child project matrix of responses included in the package for detailed responses.

Kenya: Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya

FAO Response:

1. As mentioned in the earlier response, currently, coffee production may not be the major driver of land degradation on Mt. Elgon. New commitments towards expansion of coffee and maize production, coupled with the stated existing systemic challenges, represent an important threat to the ecosystem. On the other hand, agricultural expansion (maize production) is one of the major threats to the remaining forest ecosystems. As such, and in line with the GEF-7 guidance on impact programs, this is a “frontier landscape where opportunity exists to preempt expansion and get ahead of commercial commodity-driven forest loss”.

2. The project will build upon County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) and the spatial land-use plans under development which give an overall framework for development and public investments at county level over five years. These plans are aiming to co-ordinate the work of both levels of the government in a coherent plan to improve the quality of life for all the people and contribute towards devolution. As articulated in the plans, both counties are committed to realize a food secure

and wealthy County with sustainable management and utilization of land and water. The project will also build on spatial land-use plans and the Ecosystem Management Plans for the gazetted forest areas to ensure better linkages between the forest and agriculture sector stakeholders and objectives.

3. The main entry point of the project is sustainability both through inclusive development of targeted value chains in line with the overarching policies such as the Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan and the Integrated National Export Development and Promotion Strategy which focus on promoting sustainable approach in a coordinated manner. Both for coffee and maize, the project will build on existing sustainability manuals (such as KCSM) and work with smallholders, resource-user groups and cooperatives to promote the adoption of Good Agricultural Practices (such as agroforestry, intercropping, conservation agriculture) following the Farmer Field School Approach.

4. The maize producing smallholder farmers in Western Kenya suffer from years of land degradation which has had a serious impact on soil productivity. The limited access to credit and technologies to adopt SLM practices provides a significant barrier for farmers, as well as limited knowledge on resilient, climate-smart agricultural practices. Extension services to smallholder farmers also have been limited and although physical access to markets has improved, the transaction costs to market information and marketing processes are high and as such limited to wealthier farmers. Changing climate patterns characterized by erratic rains and pest invasions – Fall Army Worm and desert locust – exacerbate the problems. In addition, farmers have been converting maize farms into sugar cane plantations threatening food security and placing further pressure on the landscape.

Barriers that need to be addressed for sustainable and inclusive coffee value chain development include lack of coordinated integrated land-use planning and management, weak governance and capacity of cooperatives, limited technical capacity to adopt sustainable coffee production practices, limited access to improved technologies, limited access to finance and markets.

5. Existing relevant platforms, such as the Joint Agricultural Sector Steering Committee (JASSCOM), which facilitates the counties to domesticate the ASTGS, the Kenya Coffee Platform and the inter-sectoral working group on FLR will be mobilized to share lessons learned and influence planning and upscaling in other coffee/maize growing areas.

6. Specific focus will be on sharing experiences with the IP brother project in Uganda which is also focusing on coffee value chain on the Western side of Mt. Elgon. This transboundary nature of both projects would provide ideal lessons learned for other countries to avoid leakages across borders.

Though the Global Platform, as largest global forum on integrated land-use, partnerships will be sought to mobilize and harness key global initiatives and existing coalitions such as the Food and Land Use coalition, the World Coffee Producer Forum (WCPF) and the Global Landscape Forum and its members. The Forest, Trees and Agroforestry programme for example provide a good opportunity to enhance capacity of project stakeholders and lessons can be learned from their efforts and experience on certification programs. The project will also link up with the International Coffee Organization and the Inter African Coffee Organization (ICAO) as they launched a regional Africa Coffee Facility to boost Africa's coffee industry and achieve a 40 percent increase in high-quality exports worth \$5 billion a year. Similar regional facilities have been implemented across the world, and valuable lessons can be learned on attracting private and public sector investment to transform Africa's coffee industry from a subsistence to a commercial or entrepreneurial approach.

Please also refer to child project matrix of responses included in the package for detailed responses.

Nicaragua: Transforming Food Systems and Reducing Deforestation in the Protected Areas and Biological Corridors landscapes from the Southern Caribbean Coast and San Juan River autonomous region

FAO Response:

1. The section has been revised to including the link with food systems. Two paragraphs have been added to clarify how environmental degradation is caused by the selected commodities
2. The country context has been edited to include the comments and to shorten its length. Additional information has been provided on planned interventions with other actors in the value chain.
3. The section has been revised and significantly shortened. Detailed list of baseline projects and stakeholders have been moved to annexes 3 and 4.
4. The text has been revised to detail how land use planning will be done based on FAO experience with different tools. The section on the engagement with the global and Regional Framework has been revised to account for comments provided.
5. The text has been revised to make the logframe clearer. The improvement in the efficiency of the animal resource (increase in the output / input ratio) and the selection of animals with low GHG emissions per unit of food consumption, are two of the main objectives for which breeding and genetic improvements can contribute to mitigate emissions. Developments in breeding and genetics are based on research that involves the selection and use of animals that have identified desirable characteristics. Once improvements in specific characteristics are achieved, these superior genotypes can be considered "best practices" and are ready for use on livestock farms.

Any individual variation in emissions between animals creates opportunities for breeding and selection programs to investigate lower-emission animals. Other factors influencing animal emissions have their origin in microbial ecology and stomach anatomy. For example, feeding strategies in neonates could have a lasting influence on the microbial ecology of the rumen and therefore on methane emissions during the productive life of an animal.

Close cooperation between the agri-food industry, breeding organizations and research institutes is beneficial in supporting this development. It is also essential to prioritize national and international research and innovation initiatives in order to mitigate GHG emissions.

Barriers to overcome: The evaluation of genetic merit can be difficult, since the actual production results depend not only on the animal itself, but also on animal nutrition and management practices.

6. The project will not include PA management; this will be done under a forthcoming GEF-7 project. Target lands to be restored will be determined during project preparation based on the interests of local communities and local and regional development programs.

7. The section has been revised to account for comments provided.

Please also refer to child project matrix of responses included in the package for detailed responses.

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/06/20.

No, the PFD addendum is not recommended for technical clearance. Please address the following comments:

FOLUR PFD ADDENDUM

Table B

- Component 2: the outcome 'Partners, value chain actors, financiers and investors regularly convened, motivated and influenced to promote innovation, replication & scale up' should be separated from the previous one (as it is in the original PFD).
- For component 4 "Program Coordination, Collaboration, and Capacity Building," please confirm that no additional financing above what has been approved in the original PFD submission is being directed to the Global Platform Child Project.

Core indicators

- Core indicators need to be revised as they are not consistent with the country concepts. Please also check to ensure that there hasn't been any double counting between Indicator 1, Indicator 3, and indicator 4.
- Core indicator 1- Please make sure that the 683,549ha listed under indicator 1 is attributed correctly. As the focus of the FOLUR program is to work in landscapes outside of protected areas, most of the targeted landscapes where improved practices are being sought should fall under core indicator 4, which excludes protected areas.
- Core indicator 3: the 10M hectares estimate does not look realistic considering that this is larger than the GEF-7 overall target. Please revise accordingly.
- Core indicator 9: Please indicate if there is any reduction of chemical inputs.
- Core indicator 11: the number of beneficiaries is low: 45,000 as compared to 2M in the PFD addendum 2 and 7M in the PFD. Please revise to better reflect a more accurate estimate.

New Countries and Regions

- In the table of countries, commodities and titles, please demonstrate how these new countries fit within in existing main commodity landscapes by indicating the main entry point crop only, eg. Guinea=Palm, Kenya=Coffee, Nicaragua=both Cocoa & Livestock are okay, Uzbekistan=Wheat

Contribution of the new Child Projects to the Program's objective and results

- Please explain how each of these countries adds to the exiting portfolio. For example, it might be mentioned that Uzbekistan is a wheat producer and this add to this scale and scope of this commodity in the FOLUR portfolio; Guinea is a frontier palm country and a transboundary landscape with Liberia; Kenya is in the coffee

landscape in East Africa and a transboundary landscape with Uganda; and Nicaragua is part of a mixed crop landscape (Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, Colombia) in LAC, etc.

- Please include more specific information on private sector engagement related to the additional countries.

Guinea

- Please mention how the project will work at the policy level on land concessioning, HCV & HCS national harmonization, etc., all of which are of primary importance in frontier landscapes. The transboundary nature of the landscape with Liberia should also be referenced.

Kenya

- Please place greater emphasis on the transboundary nature of the landscape with Uganda as this is a unique feature.

Uzbekistan

- Important to reference planned coordination with Kazakhstan, a country Uzbek borders that is also part of the FOLUR program and focusing on wheat.

Alignment with national Priorities

-For Kenya the “TBC” should be taken out of the description

Revised GEF-7 Financing

- Remove the last line: ‘This includes Kenya.’

FOLUR COUNTRY CONCEPTS

Guinea: Integrated management of degraded landscapes for sustainable food systems and livelihoods in Guinea Forest Region and Upper Guinea

1. Clarify interventions capturing policy/strategies/legislation related to other aspects of the value chain beyond the landscape level. E.g. sustainable financing, sustainable sourcing for traders, land concessioning, HCV & HCS national harmonization, etc.
2. Describe the context for country policy and positioning with regard to the sustainability of the palm oil sector and landscape planning.
3. Describe current status and engagement of all relevant supply chain actors beyond just the producers
4. Clarify core indicators targets relative to estimates provided in EOI as they appear relatively low.
5. Clarify importance and value-add of the integrated approach and how the project components, outcomes and expected outputs are aligned with the Program ToC, including its objectives and key interventions.

6. Highlight plans to coordinate with regional palm oil countries to address this threat and the planned ‘South-South cooperation,’ including opportunity presented by the transboundary nature of the landscape for potential coordination with the project in Liberia.

Uzbekistan: Food System, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program in Uzbekistan

1. Please justify or remove restoration of mangroves as part of the project indicators and activities, as this doesn’t appear to be in line with the project design.
2. Further describe the impact of unsustainable practices of wheat production on the environment, beyond degradation of productive lands.
3. Explain how the project will enable smallholders to adopt alternatives to intensive wheat monoculture.
4. Clarify how the project’s impact will be scaled throughout Uzbekistan and beyond its borders, including the strategy for engaging existing regional or global platforms, and external private sector actors in the wheat value chain.
5. Better define the incremental reasoning of the project and the GEF added contribution to the existing baseline.

Kenya: Integrated Landscape Management for conservation and restoration of the Mt. Elgon Ecosystem in Western Kenya

1. Please make it clearer how the land degradation on Mt. Elgon is attributable to the production of coffee .
2. Provide further information on the current context of comprehensive land use planning, and how site level landscape planning will be scaled to influence planning in other coffee growing areas or at the national level.
3. Provide more details on how the project seeks not only to increase productivity, but safeguard the environment through specific improvements in sustainable production techniques.
4. Specify the drivers and barriers of the coffee and maize sectors that are distinct to each sector. Moreover, explain what kind of agriculture restoration is being considered and how it will relate to these targeted commodities.
5. Clarify how the project plans to engage beyond the landscape level so that systemic issues and challenges are better addressed along the whole supply chain.
6. Explain how the project will mobilize and harness key regional/global initiatives to drive transformational change.

Nicaragua: Transforming Food Systems and Reducing Deforestation in the Protected Areas and Biological Corridors landscapes from the Southern Caribbean Coast and San Juan River autonomous region

1. Provide more detail on the environmental and land degradation caused by the production of cocoa and beef.
2. More clearly identify the challenges related to aspects of the supply chain beyond the producer level, and explain planned interventions with different supply chain actors.
3. Provide more concise information on the relevant baseline investments and ensure that they are clearly linked to the project.
4. Please clarify the integrating planning approach of the project and explain how the project will upscale the ILM approach to other regions and nationally.

5. Clarify what is intended to be achieved by the outcomes under component 3, which is focused on restoring natural habitats that includes capacity building for technological conversion to more intensive [sic], genetic improvement and management for low-emission livestock and increased resilience. It is not clear how these contribute to FOLUR program objectives.
6. Please confirm that forest conservation activities don't include PA management or provide a clear rationale of how protected area management efforts are aligned with the FOLUR project design.
7. More clearly describe the project's plan for an engagement with the Global/Regional Framework. (The discussion on innovations would perhaps better fit in the incremental reasoning or another section).

April 20, 2020:

Thank you for the clarifications and adjustments provided to address comments. We have determined these responses to be sufficient at this stage. The addendum to the FOLUR Impact Program is recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

During the PPG phase, to ensure strong child projects, please pay attention on the following recommendations that need to be considered:

Guinea:

- Explain further how the project will work at the policy level on land concessioning, HCV & HCS national harmonization, etc., all of which are of primary importance in frontier landscapes;
- Provide additional details on the country policy and positioning with regard to the sustainability of commodities and landscape planning;
- Describe further the needed interventions beyond the producer level, including the improvements needed in the governance and policy framework to lay the foundation for value chain development.

Uzbekistan:

- Provide additional data to further clarify the magnitude and specific aspects of environmental degradation caused by wheat production;
- Clarify which specific private sector (including financial) actors and/or regional/global platforms will be engaged either at the regional or global level. This is useful in demonstrating how the project will contribute to regional/global transformation of the wheat food system.

Kenya

- Explain further how site level landscape planning will be scaled to influence planning in other coffee growing areas or at the national level.

Nicaragua

- Provide more detailed information of the stakeholders involved in the value chain beyond the production level, as well as their engagement in the project.

Review Dates

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Contribution of the addendum to the FOLUR PFD:

The addendum includes four new countries and represents an important expansion in the coverage of globally important geographies and commodities building upon the 23 countries in the first and second round selection and contributing to both scale and sustainability. Importantly, with Uzbekistan joining the IP, the geographic coverage of wheat production landscapes in Central Asia is improved with the linkage to neighboring Kazakhstan. Thus expanding the scope for transboundary collaboration. With Nicaragua joining Mexico, Guatemala, Peru, Colombia as an IP country in LAC, the representative coverage of the mixed crop landscape of commodities and countries in Central America is more complete and stronger. Inclusion of Guinea as a frontier palm country in West Africa complements the strong representation of countries in the region, including Liberia, Ghana and Nigeria. Adding Kenya in East Africa strengthens the program's representation in that region with coffee and maize as key commodities. The Kenya and Uganda CPs also now form the a unique transboundary landscape (around Mt Elgon) in the portfolio. The addition of the new countries also captures additional potential for private sector engagements, which will contribute to the FOLUR IP's reach and impact. With these additions, the FOLUR IP will include 27 participating countries.

Global Environment benefits:

The expected Global Environment Benefits of the addendum are the following: 83,027 ha of land restored, 1,134,442 ha of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems, and 16,748,246 tCO₂e of GHG emissions mitigated. In addition, the four additional child projects will benefit to 105,000 stakeholders.

Co-financing:

The expected co-financing of the addendum is estimated at US\$ 213,685,000, including 46% as grant.