



Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes

Basic Information

GEF ID

10206

Countries

Global (Angola, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malawi, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Tanzania, Zimbabwe)

Project Title

Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program on Dryland Sustainable Landscapes

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO, World Bank, IUCN, WWF-US

Agency ID**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

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

4/17/2019:

Yes.

05/01/2019: Program Commitment deadline is INCORRECT: correct is **December 2020**.

05/02/2019: To be precise, please enter **14 December 2020**.

Agency Response

05/02/2019

This has been corrected.

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

4/17/2019:

Yes. However, please consider the following suggestions:

- The inclusion of indicators and targets in table B overloads an otherwise straightforward table and makes it hard to follow the numbers when you compare them to what is included in Table E under the core indicators. This is also a source of inconsistencies and figures can't be easily understood if the sub-indicator worksheet is not at hand. Our suggestion would be to remove this information from Table B and instead include it under the component descriptions and the GEB section (which actually needs more information).

Specific comments

-Outcome 1.1

- The barriers mention inadequate provisions for local participation. The text for Outcome 1.1 could be strengthened re the inclusion of local communities/stakeholders in the process to improve the policy framework. This would also ensure gender issues and indigenous/local communities issues are captured at this level.

- Private sector should also be mentioned here

-Outcome 1.3- How is improved sufficiently being defined? How is the PFD proposing to do things differently, given that land tenure issues have come up in many single country projects before? This could be detailed more to show the added value of the Ip intervention.

-Outcome 1-4- Details on the activities to achieve this outcome could be expanded? The private sector should also be included here.

05/01/2019:

PARTLY ADDRESSED (some of the **specific** comments above have not been fully addressed)

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

- 1) As suggested, the indicators and targets have been removed from Table B and are now presented in grey text boxes at the start of the description of each Outcome, in the text, and also in the Global Environmental Benefits section.
- 2) Additional detail has now been added on proposed participatory processes for feeding inputs into policy formulation, in the description of outcome 1.2. Text under outcome 1.1 now refers to the potential for public-private cooperation in policy formulation processes.
- 3) Text under outcome 1.3 explains that work to strengthen governance, tenure and access conditions will be guided by case-by-case analyses of constraints on sustainable management.
- 4) we are also providing additional information on the activities proposed to achieve Outcome 1.4.

The second para after Box 10 explains that one of the aspects of the incremental value of the program will be that mechanisms and conditions exist to address the multiple and complex ways in which governance, tenure and access determine the social and environmental

outcomes of dryland management. Outcome 1.3 also explains in detail the incremental value of the program in this regard.

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

4/17/2019:

Not fully.

The co-financing table includes entities that have been misidentified as GEF Agencies (EU, UNESCO), and one that has been misidentified as a recipient country government (DfID). Moreover, where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

Please make every effort to identify additional co-financing in the category "investment mobilized", especially for Upper Middle-Income Countries (UMIC) and High-Income Countries (HIC) that are not Least Developed Countries (LDC) or Small Island Developing States (SIDS). In this context, please clarify why for Kazakhstan the World Bank loan of \$200 million is listed as "Recurrent Expenditures".

Finally, please disaggregate by entity (e.g. all ministries, all GEF agencies, all private sector, etc. and add the name of country after the mention of the entities as applicable as the portal table otherwise doesn't show the country from which the contribution comes.

05/01/2019 PARTLY ADDRESSED:

Where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized" (e.g. IUCN in Burkina Faso, Naturama CSO in Burkina Faso, and beneficiaries' in kind contribution to matching grants in Mozambique).

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/02/2019

The table has been reviewed and modified accordingly.

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

4/17/2019:

Not fully.

Please address the discrepancies between the CEO Endorsement Letters and Table D of the PFD submission.

-Burkina Faso: (-1) dollar difference in CC

-Malawi: (+1) dollar difference in BD and (-1) dollar difference in MFA

Please also note a few discrepancies below, between the PFD and the child projects. Please check and make corrections where necessary.

- Namibia-Agency Fee for LD (Pg.7) in the Child Project PIF is different from the Agency Fee figure in the PFD. The PFD has \$327,837 and the child project PIF has \$327,836

-Mozambique- BD STAR total has different figures in the Child Project and the PFD.

-Burkina Faso- BD STAR total has different figures in the Child Project and the PFD. It is off by \$1 so the figure may have been rounded up in the child project

-Kazakhstan- SFM IP set-aside for FAO has different figures in the Child Project and the PFD. It is off by \$1 so the figure may have been rounded up in the PFD

05/01/2019: ADDRESSED

At this stage no further comments, a final check of financial figures will be done by GEF PPO before clearance.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED by PM (a final check of financial figures will be done by GEF PPO before CEO clearance)

Agency Response

05/02/2019

Addressed- there were minor 1\$ inconsistencies due to rounding.

Figures are consistent with the LoEs and with actual available STAR amounts

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

CLEARED

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes

CLEARED

Agency Response**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**

04/17/2019 UA:

Yes.

CLEARED

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

n/a

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

4/17/2019:

Not fully.

Please address the comments below:

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

- Latest at CEO endorsement stage it would be useful to see how these numbers were calculated. We have noticed that some child projects (e.g. Mongolia) have included the entire project area between these three indicators, whereas others (e.g. Botswana) have used hectare values for these indicators that represent a 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. Recommendation is to look at the CO₂e per hectare value in different countries and check outliers. Seeing the assumptions made in the calculations and/or Ex-ACT tools would be very useful. We would be very happy to review and provide comments and suggestions for any Ex-ACT files.
- There should be some level connection between the hectares in production (4.3) and the number of beneficiaries (farmers) – based on an estimate of number of hectares per farmer. In most of the participating countries the unit of beneficiary is the family farm and they usually own about 1 – 1.5 hectares per farm. There are some child projects with a ration closer to 1 ha per beneficiary and some with closer to 100 ha per beneficiary.

3. Program Level Targets – the cumulative figures are reasonable, however, there are obvious calculation errors and typos in the entries.

- Indicator 3 (restoration): The outlier here is Mongolia (576,000 ha), which needs to be checked if this can be realistically achieved by the project.
-
- Indicator 4 (improved practices in landscapes): PFD target on portal (16.5 m ha). We noticed that there is a typo for Botswana (shown as 5,770,000 when it should be **577,000.00 ha**). Additionally, there are large discrepancies in the core indicator worksheet in the child project for Kenya under this indicator.
- The core sub-indicator on HCVF (4.4) has been incorrectly entered into the portal. According to the individual child projects, the total should be 338,800.00 ha.
-
- Indicator 6 (carbon): Program cumulative target is 56.7 m tons CO₂e. But there is a typo in the value for Namibia (shown as 17,760 instead of 17,760,000) as in the attached Ex-ACT screenshot. This would lead to a total PFD estimate of 92.7 m tons CO₂e, which would appear quite high.
- Note also that these errors are also resulting in the regional child project having incorrect indicator estimates since it is taking 10% of each.
-

Child Projects

Botswana

- The issue of the extra zero under core indicator 4 should be corrected

Burkina-Faso

- Fix discrepancy in CI 6 (40,000 in PFD table and 50,000 in child project table)

Kazakhstan

- Consider adding a target for CI 1 given that child project concept mentions adding a protected area
- Annex A gives a breakdown of the indicator values. Note that for CI 4, the 10,000 ha of agroforestry as envisioned is double counting the same 10,000 that are considered in CI 3 as planted and managed as orchards. Recommend removing these 10,000 from CI 4.

Kenya

- Note that they include 500,000 ha in Core Indicator 1 that is not included in the PFD summary table. But this number is shown as 70,000 ha in the Core Indicator worksheet in the same child project PIF. Needs clarification.

- CI 3: 400,000 ha (note that PFD shows 147,000 ha). Then the Core Indicator worksheet says that the value for CI 3 is 200,000 ha. The numbers also don't add up in the worksheet:
- $3.1 + 3.2 + 3.3 + 3.4 = 50,000 + 5,000 + 15,000 + 100 = \mathbf{70,100 \text{ ha}}$
- CI 4: 200,000 ha (note that PFD shows 890,000 ha). Then the Core Indicator worksheet says that the value for CI 4 is 600,000 ha. The numbers also don't add up in the worksheet:
- $4.1 + 4.2 + 4.3 + 4.4 = 300,000 + 0 + 400,000 + 120,000 = \mathbf{820,000 \text{ ha}}$
- Note also that the requirements for HCVF are stringent – in that first there must be evidence that the area meets the HCV standard set by the HCV committee; second, there must be a business-as-usual scenario deforestation projection, and then a with-project scenario to determine the ha of forest loss avoided at the HCV area. (Not required at this point, but something to keep in mind)
- CI 6: 1,500,000 t CO₂e (note that PFD shows 440,000 t CO₂e). Then the Core Indicator worksheet says that the value for CI 6 is 30,000 t CO₂e (direct). The numbers also don't add up in the worksheet:
- $6.1 + 6.2 = 30,000 + 20,000 = \mathbf{50,000 \text{ t CO}_2\text{e (direct)}}$.
- If you plan to use 6.2 (non-AFOLU CO₂e reduction) then it would be great to know how you came up with the estimate.

Malawi

- Core indicator 6 is null in the core indicator table (PFD has 1,820,000 t CO₂e) – this should be broken down into sub-indicators
- The figures for CI 4 should be broken into sub-indicators

Mongolia

- Total project area 6.86 million ha which seems to be very high given the project scope and approach
- 575,538 under land restoration (3.3) also seems unrealistic to be achieved and attributed to the project.
- The sum of the hectares in their indicator values is equal to the entire project area

Mozambique

- No core indicator worksheet provided

Namibia

- The core indicator table and the screenshot of the Ex-ACT file shows 17.76 million tons CO₂e. This is by far the largest figure for indicator 6 of the entire program especially given the moderate estimates for targeted area. This is not plausible, please check. (Also note that in the portal entry for the accumulative program targets, this figure of 17.76 million tons has not been included).

•

05/01/2019: Please provide the names of the protected areas in Kenya and Malawi in the core indicator table.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/02/2019

Botswana – Addressed

Burkina Faso- addressed

Kazakhstan- The PA could not be selected at this stage and will be further defined at PPG and therefore no indicators is provided at this stage. Value for CI4 removed as suggested

KENYA- Numbers have been revised- no HCV area of forest loss avoided will be targeted and emissions will come exclusively from the AFOLU sector - The name of the PA for Kenia has been entered

MALAWI – Indicators broken down by sub-indicators as requested. The there is still uncertainty on which PA to target in Malawi so these amounts have been removed for now and will be addressed at PPG stage

MONGOLIA – The total project area is a manageable size. We are basically talking about 6800 herder households or ~23,500 people with 1.8 MLN livestock living in 9 counties that has territory of 6.86 mln ha. This about 10 percent of total people and 17.8 percent of livestock residing in three eastern Mongolian provinces. The project will be working only 9 counties out of 45 counties and government will not probably accept lowering the number counties because we negotiated hard to minimize number of provinces at the onset.

This number came out as a 50% of the severely affected (152,850 ha) and strongly affected (998,025 ha) areas in the target 9 counties. We expect that majority of the amelioration will be removing pressure and allow natural regeneration of the pastureland with least possible physical/mechanical interventions. The area is only 8.3 percent of total areas in the target counties, therefore, negotiation with herders for releasing/limiting the area from grazing should not be a big issue.

MOZAMBIQUE - Addressed

NAMIBIA - Addressed

We have also reduced the size of the cropland targeted by the project and revised the carbon value accordingly (agro-forestry/perennial + improved practices). The very short time available for the preparation of EoI(s) and subsequent PIF(s) has not allowed a very detailed planning with all relevant stakeholders in all the countries. The project intervention area and exact coverage will hence be discussed and if necessary, refined during the PPG.

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.

CLEARED

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

4/17/2019:

The analytical part of the PFD, the analysis of barriers and drivers of environmental degradation are fully adequate.

- Child Program Selection Criteria. Please include a short description of how child projects were selected by including a sentence from the evaluation report: "On the deadline of January 31st, GEFSEC received 20 valid Expressions of Interest (EOI) submitted by 5 agencies. The EOIs were reviewed by an evaluation committee, assessed and ranked according to the selection criteria. FAO as the lead agency for the Impact Program recused itself from the evaluation process."

- This section also asks the contribution of each child project to program impact. Please insert the summary table of how each child project contributes to the core indicators at this place. This table is only available in the uploaded pdf version and has not been included into the portal. Such a brief summary table would also help to present the program 'in a nutshell' in this section.

05/01/2019:

PARTLY ADDRESSED.

Figure 8 is too detailed and may confuse readers due to most of countries not being included in the program. Please delete and describe in one sentence.

Please provide the summary table of how each child project contributes to the core indicators as an Annex. This Annex may be added to the child project concept supporting document (pdf version to be uploaded under documents).

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/02/2019

Figure 8 has been deleted and explanation has been added into the text, as requested.

The summary table is included at the end of the child PIFs consolidated document as suggested.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

The baseline scenario is adequately described.

05/01/2019: However, the baseline scenario is very difficult to read as it has long and incomplete sentences and lots of generic terms. Please edit for readability.

Please mention PRIVATE SECTOR in the baseline scenario (so that this can be addressed by the alternative GEF scenario).

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/02/2019

The bullet points under baseline scenario have been reviewed and edited for clarity.

Private sector issues have now been addressed in the baseline scenario description and Private Sector Engagement section as well as elsewhere in the text.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes. However, there is a general impression that the program is focused on the targeted landscapes in the 11 child projects. While this is of course the major field of activity for the program, it somehow doesn't fully address the question of how the program will achieve transformative impact on the entire drylands agenda. Figure 13 "Dimensions of scaling" touches on this issue but needs to be elaborated on, especially in the description of the Global Child project.

Further, when PFD presents the transboundary scaling-out effect, it may be worth adding a sentence or two on how this would be done and how consent/buy-in from stakeholders of the other countries would be ensured.

- Country-specific information. There are instances where some child country examples are presented, but it needs then an explanation of why not all countries are listed (maybe saying that these countries will specifically address this). For example under "trends and challenges facing drylands," having a summary table that includes all countries would be better. Another example is under "Baseline Investments" where the level of detail was inconsistent and not all countries were represented. Likewise for the examples proposed under child projects under the components description. I think this section could instead begin with a description/reference to the global and regional initiatives that are considered baseline (ex: GGW) followed by a nice summary table that includes all countries. The box titled "The potential for landscape rehabilitation in the Sahel: an example from Niger." it's a nice example, but doesn't add much here and may give the impression that Niger is included in the program.

05/01/2019: Mostly adequate. Please include mention of how, strategically, the program will engage with PRIVATE SECTOR (excluding smallholder farmers) in alternative scenario.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

4/17/2019

1) Text associated to Figure 13 explain how the “nested approach” to landscape management goes beyond the landscape level to national and regional levels. Text after figure 13 in the section Section "Scaling out and deep", explains how the Program is designed, and will be implemented, in such a way as to result in scaling out of impacts at regional level, beyond the boundaries of the 11 target countries: actions proposed under Component 3, in relation to transboundary knowledge management, outreach and transboundary coordination, will allow the 11 countries to function as nuclei for the catalysis of scaling out to neighboring countries, including both other IP target countries and other, non-IP countries with similar conditions.

2) Section "Scaling out and deep" explains how consent and buy-in will be ensured in transboundary scaling-out processes: attention will be paid in this scaling-out process to minimize the risk of selected aspects of dryland management being replicated in a “cookie cutter” fashion without adequate consideration being paid to their relevance to local needs and conditions: to this end, the program will focus on communicating the need for integrated packages of approaches, including situation analyses, participatory design processes and the development of capacities for improving knowledge exchange, monitoring and adaptive management to accompany and support technical models.

3) The country-specific descriptions of threats, enabling conditions and baseline investments have now been expanded to cover all of the target countries (Boxes 2, 4 and 5). In some cases only a selection of countries have been mentioned but the text makes it clear that these are examples (of countries where the issue in question is particularly relevant or where there are specific experience and good practices on which to build).

4) The information in the box on Niger has been moved to the body of the text, with a clear explanation that Niger is not directly included in the program. It remains a useful illustration that the restoration approaches proposed have been proven to be feasible under comparable conditions to those in the target countries.

05/02/2019

Section 4 refers specifically to how the Program and child projects will engage with private sector actors, and references are now included throughout the document (especially in the Outcome text) to the important roles proposed for the private sector. References to the private sector in the PFD reflect the specific conditions typical of drylands: compared with food system initiatives in more humid areas, major global commodities (and corresponding big private sector players) are typically of relatively limited significance. As the majority of dryland areas are remote with low productivity levels and mainly subsistence farming systems (at least in the context of Africa where the majority of child projects are), a bottom up approach (stressed in the alternative scenario) will be promoted – building capacity of local producer organizations and linking them (and surplus dryland produce) to national and/or regional markets with support of regional networks.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Yes but not fully. The program is aligned with the respective focal area and Impact Program strategy.

However, please remove mention of ineligible BD focal area objectives (GWP, Natural capital assessment and accounting, agro-biodiversity, inclusive conservation).

Instead, in this section, please also consider to mention on how the program addresses private sector involvement, which is a cross-cutting issue in all focal areas and IP strategies. There is a separate section in the GEF-7 programming directions on private sector, which can be referred to.

05/01/2019: PARTLY ADDRESSED. Please remove mention of ineligible BD focal area objectives in paragraph 139 (GWP, Natural capital assessment and accounting, agro-biodiversity, inclusive conservation).

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/02/2019

Reference to the mentioned ineligible focal area objectives has already been removed from the text, although some reference to the issues involved is still retained as co-benefits.

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**

4/15/2019:

Yes, however please note comments in the private sector section and ensure these are featured here as well.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

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

4/17/2019:

Yes. The targets are reasonable and achievable. However, as mentioned above, some inconsistencies in the data need to be addressed.

05/01/2019: ADDRESSED

CLEARED

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

Sustainability

The text in a few sections of the PFD could be strengthened in terms of sustainability, such as Outcomes 1.1 and 1.4.- plans for the continuity and sustainability of the multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms should be considered. Such as whether or not they are being anchored in an existing coordinating body/agency, intersectoral plan or if there will be budget support at the national level. Other initiatives that may involve data collection and analysis for land use planning purposes, it would be important to establish data ownership and maintenance arrangements as well as terms for data sharing. In terms of interventions that include training of farmers, extension officers, value chain actors, financial institutions, government stakeholders, consideration should be made for how the training will be institutionalized to increase the likelihood of scaling up and out after the project has ended.

01/05/2019: NOT YET ADDRESSED

No revision to the text has been identified. Please clarify if recommendations have been considered in the Alternative Scenario section.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

1) Text under description of outcome.1.1 specifically proposes measures to ensure that the coordination and collaboration arrangements proposed under Outcome 1.1 will be lasting in nature

2) The promotion of transboundary cooperation will where possible be anchored in existing, well-established coordination mechanisms. These are further detailed in relation to Outcome 3.1.

3) Text referred to Outcome 1.2 now specifically states that “during the formulation processes of individual child projects, specific attention will be paid to establishing arrangements for data ownership and maintenance arrangements, as well as terms for data sharing”.

05/02/2019

4) Description of Outcome 2.1 now includes more detailed explanation of how the child projects will contribute to the sustainability of service provision, through the strengthening of extension systems and local capacities

Please note that in the first round of responses, it was highlighted that changes to the text had been made to respond to the comments: Outcome 1.2 now specifically states that “during the formulation processes of individual child projects, specific attention will be paid to establishing arrangements for data ownership and maintenance arrangements, as well as terms for data sharing”, and Outcome 2.1 now includes more detailed explanation of how the child projects will contribute to the sustainability of service provision, through the strengthening of extension systems and local capacities.

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

4/17/2019:

Yes.

CLEARED

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

4/17/2019:

In general, at this stage the information provided regarding Stakeholder Engagement is fully acceptable. However, please note:

Stakeholder consultations: Given the nature of the Program, stakeholder consultations are key to guaranteeing the effective participation and transparency as well as improved governance. It's always best practice to start the consultations early in the process. Time constraints were cited as the reason for the limited consultations that took place in the design of the Program. However, some consultations were done at the National Dialogues with the participating CSOs and other stakeholders. These processes should be reinforced during the PPG stage, particularly with those stakeholders that will be 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: The PFD lists outcomes and targets that include engagement, capacity development, and improved governance of stakeholders. There is particular reference to the engagement of stakeholders in the child projects and mechanisms and methodologies to guarantee that. Particular means of engagement are included in the relevant section. Is it possible to include a list of potential stakeholders at this stage?

Please also note that the Stakeholder Engagement requirements (including the formulation of a [Stakeholder Engagement Plan](#)) are not a safeguard issue but an active requirement under the approved GEF Policy. During the detailed budget preparation, specific resources should be allocated in the Program to ensure adequate engagement of stakeholders. Reference is herewith made to the approved [Policy on Stakeholder Engagement](#) as well as the corresponding [Guidelines](#) for more information.

05/01/2019:

Please DELETE mentioning of time constraints in stakeholder consultations. It is understood that more detailed consultations will take place during PPG phase.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/01/2019:

Done

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

4/17/2019:

Not fully. The normative framework sensibly intertwines environmental, social and economic variables. It highlights the most important social elements of dryland management including issues of good governance, inclusion, equity, equal access and tenure rights. The PFD includes relevant recent studies and research on gender dimensions related to desertification and land degradation and integrates these considerations in the different components of the program.

However, please clarify and consider additional roles and responsibilities of the Global Coordination Project to guide and support efforts on gender. Specifically related to component 2 (knowledge management and outreach); and 3 (programmatic monitoring). In the proposed programmatic and sub-programmatic M&E systems, please include adequate common gender indicators related to tenure, access and use rights, technical capacity development, and market and credit access and livelihood diversification.

Further, please articulate clearly how the program will address gender and inclusion issues related to their efforts to (1) improve security of tenure, access and use rights; and (2) technical capacity building, business development, market and credit access and livelihood diversification. The PFD makes a strong normative argument why existing gender inequalities in these areas that must be addressed but it doesn't provide details in terms of describing concrete measures to implement this. While not required in GEF's policy on gender, the program would benefit from having a succinct framework on gender e.g. a gender action plan or strategy to make its gender mainstreaming efforts more explicitly visible in program/project development and implementation.

Please consider following detailed suggestions as appropriate:

1. The Role of the Global Coordination Project.

a. provide some indicative information on what role they can play in terms of promoting gender mainstreaming related to component 2 (knowledge management and outreach) e.g. capturing lessons learnt and facilitate links with processes and institutions working on gender, as well as providing training and technical assistance to national project implementation teams and stakeholders at national and regional levels on tools related to gender.

b. provide some further details related to component 3 (programmatic monitoring) e.g. developing a program level action plan on gender during the PPG phase to make the gender mainstreaming efforts more explicitly visible during implementation and in the collaboration with the child projects. Moreover, while some program indicators already are disaggregated by gender, consider supporting the development of some program specific gender indicators related to tenure, access and use rights, technical capacity development, and market and credit access and livelihood diversification in the proposed programmatic and sub-programmatic M&E systems.

2. Provide additional indicative information on measures to address gender. For example, offer some more details in:

a. Outcome area 1.2: E.g. consider including efforts to reach out to and connect with national agencies/ministries and other non-governmental actors working on gender related to rural development etc.

b. Outcome area 1.3: E.g. incorporate a specific focus on women in the proposed analyses of existing conditions of tenure and use rights.

c. Outcome area 2.1: E.g. make a specific reference to target women as part of the planned activities to support technical capacity building, business development, market and credit access and livelihood diversification.

05/01/2019: NOT YET ADDRESSED

The recommended improvements are not evident in the relevant sections of the PFD, such as the Project Description or Table B. Please clarify.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

05/02/2019

Please note that significant insertions have been made in order to ensure that gender issues are adequately provided for in the Program and the Global Coordination Project.

I brief:

- A para on how the program will address gender and inclusion issues related to their efforts to improve security of tenure, access and use rights
- The inclusion of gender issues in relation to technical capacity building, business development, market and credit access and livelihood diversification has been addressed throughout the relevant parts of the document on the basis of a thorough review of the text.
- 2 paragraphs regarding the comment that the program would benefit from having a succinct framework on gender e.g. a gender action plan or strategy to make its gender mainstreaming efforts more explicitly visible in program/project development and implementation,
- more information on promoting gender mainstreaming through component 2 of the GCP.
- additional text on gender issues in relation to Component 3 of the GCP.
- In the description of Outcome area 1.3, it has been explained how a specific focus on women will be incorporated in the proposed analyses of existing conditions of tenure and use rights.
- Specific reference has been made in Outcome area 2.1 to targeting women as part of the planned activities to support technical capacity building, business development, market and credit access and livelihood diversification.
- Please note that no changes were requested to Table B in the first round of comments: however the proposed issues were incorporated as described above into the text of the PFD..

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/17/2019:

No. The private sector engagement as presented in this section is not fully adequate to reach the program objective. The reader expects a summary of the private sector engagement of the program in this section, even at the peril of redundancy, this section needs to make a consistent case. Private sector engagement was identified by the IEO of the GEF as a precondition for transformative impact. The PFD needs to elaborate in this section on how this can be achieved in the program. In addition, the Theory of Change for the program will need to reflect that as well.

The PFD needs to substantially elaborate in the private sector section on the entry points for the private sector, and how private sector involvement will help the program to achieve its objectives. Private sector involvement is not limited to contribution of co-finance. The presented table in the PFD in the private sector section also needs to provide a narrative on how the private sector will be engaged in those examples and how they benefit from their collaboration. Consider to bring the figures with entry points into the green value chain here as well. But not only the green value chains are an entry point. Another one is finance and the future mobilization of finance for the drylands agenda.

05/01/2019: NOT ADDRESSED.

The private sector section has not been revised in line with above comments. Further, the Theory of Change doesn't incorporate working with the private sector.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response In addition to the numerous additional references to private sector involvement that have now been included throughout the document, additional narrative in the section on Private Sector Engagement has been included in order to make clearer the level of importance to the Program of private sector engagement, particularly in relation to value chains and financing.

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

4/17/2019:

Yes.

CLEARED

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

4/17/2019:

The PFD needs to elaborate further on how existing global platforms will be used and why they are listed in the PFD. Currently, paragraph 130 lists 9 platforms/knowledge hubs and briefly describes them. But what is the relevance for this program, how do they link to the finance space, and what will be the interactions between them? For example, will the Global Mechanism also help to link the program to the LDN fund? How does the private sector come in here, are there any platforms/hubs that link the program with the private sector? Figure 20 makes a start in describing a general flow of knowledge and coordination between them, but that is far too general. Please focus on essential platforms/knowledge hubs that the program will concretely interact with and better describe how.

05/01/2019: PARTLY ADDRESSED.

Overall comments on the Global Coordination section still need to be better incorporated. The narrative on how the existing platforms can be brought together to facilitate KM, scaling out, transformation change is still missing. There is also inadequate information on the private sector in this section.

Please check if figure 20 is complete, it appears incomplete and doesn't add value in this form. Consider a description in text and deletion of figure 20.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response Figure 20 is now deleted. Figure 17 has been updated and revised to better illustrate the important role of the GCP in scaling out of facilitating engagement with global platforms and scaling out of project results.

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

4/17/2019:

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

However, Please add consistency with countries Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement. This needs to be emphasized as an important alignment

05/01/2019: NOT ADDRESSED.

Please add consistency with countries Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response Done

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

4/17/2019:

The PFD addressed knowledge management (KM) adequately, in line with requirements at this stage.

Below are a few recommendations to make the KM even stronger, given that it plays such a vital role for this program:

While the PFD treats KM quite well throughout the document (including effective graphics to explain proposed knowledge flows across the program and the roles & responsibilities of various stakeholders), main elements of the program’s KM approach and how these will be implemented are not fully explained **in the KM section**. Please strengthen this section of the PFD, to tie everything together, especially with respect to how the GCP will link with child projects and facilitate knowledge flow across the partnership and beyond, to benefit the child projects and vice versa.

Please summarize how the project is learning from existing lessons and best practice emerging from previous GEF investments as well as other relevant initiatives. In the main body of the document, this is mentioned in a few places; but in a very dispersed fashion. So, it would be good to include, **in the KM section**, a brief (summary) explanation of what key lessons inform the design of the program, mentioning a few concrete examples and references. For your information, the ISLANDS PFD has provided a very useful table of “lessons” along these lines; this could be an example for this proposal to follow.

The KM section mentions that “the need for shared and collaborative learning, improved strategies and tools for adaptive management” and that “The expected outcomes from this effort will be strengthened capacity amongst institutions and other stakeholders.....” This is well said; but it still rings somewhat general and incomplete. So, it would be helpful to include here a more comprehensive and focused reflection on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall program impact and sustainability – in the specific context of this PFD.

Finally, and in line with comments on the global platform, the proposal lists many partners and recent/ongoing initiative with similar goals, it would be good to know how all these partners are expected to connect, collaborate and learn from each other – across the region. When describing the work of some partners, the proposal mentions that CGP will link with or build on these efforts. However, there are many partners that are listed without any explanation of **how** they would be linked with GCP. Again, the ISLANDS PFD includes an initial rendering (graphic) of how knowledge is expected to flow among the various partners/stakeholders across the program, which may serve as an example.

05/01/2019: NOT YET ADDRESSED.

Apparently, this section has remained unchanged. Please clarify if you have taken on the recommendations made.

The comments on KM have also not been considered adequately in the Global Coordination project section.

05/02/2019 ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response These comments have been taken on board and incorporated into the Knowledge Management section.

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

4/17/2019:

Letter of Endorsement from Kazakhstan not yet signed.

Letter of Endorsement for Mongolia is not signed by the current OFP and can therefore not be accepted. LoEs must be signed by the current OFP.

05/01/2019: ADDRESSED.

CLEARED

Agency Response

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

02/05/2019: Two outstanding issues are remaining, which need to be addressed before technical clearance:

Program commitment deadline: please enter 12/14/2020 (as this would be exactly 18 months after council approval of the program)

In the portal, under ANNEX A: LIST OF CHILD PROJECTS UNDER THE PROGRAM please include a list of the child projects in form of a table as specified in the PFD template.

05/06/2019: DATA DISCREPANCIES FOUND. Please correct entries in Table D (IUCN as agency for Burkina Faso child project) and address the issue that Kazakhstan requests more than 1:2 incentive in the STAR : Incentive ratio.

05/07/2019: As per email communication. Please disregard the comment on Kazakhstan and revert to original figures in the respective tables and the Annex A in the portal as well as the child project template.

05/08/2019: Addressed. Program manager recommends PFD for CEO clearance.

2.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Additional editorial comments to consider at PFD approval stage (NOW):

- Figure 15: is MISSING, please check.
- Theory of Change: The box "threats to drylands remains unchanged - has its content been cross-checked with proposed activities to address the threats?
- Description of Theory of change: DELETE second sentence in this section: "This also reflects the GEF theory of change underlying its transformational approach....." DELETE.
- DELETE first sub-para under box 10: "IP value added and programmatic incentive: additional incentive funding has been allocated to the Impact Program...[...]...sum of its constituent projects" (that is stating the obvious - the program design already reflects that)
- remove mentioning of mining sector in Mongolia for cooperation.
- Figure 22: too detailed, please delete and describe in one sentence as appropriate.

02/05/2019: All suggestions have been considered. CLEARED

/view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/17/2019	4/20/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/1/2019	5/2/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/2/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/7/2019	