

## Towards Land Degradation Neutrality for Improved Equity, Sustainability, and Resilience

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10863

**Countries**

Cabo Verde

**Project Title**

Towards Land Degradation Neutrality for Improved Equity, Sustainability, and Resilience

**GEF Agency(ies)**

FAO

**Agency ID**

FAO: 709562

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Land Degradation

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

# PIF

## Part I – Project Informatic

### 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

September 17, 2021

Yes. The project is aligned with the LD1.1 objective on SLM, using the larger part of the GEF resources (\$1.88 million) and the LD2.5 objective on LDN (\$300,000).

Cleared.

#### 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

October 26, 2021

Addressed.

### September 17, 2021

- Project Objective formulation: We wonder if the formulation of the proposed objective is enough specific and realistic:

- - "promote" SLM, landscape restoration, and nature-based solutions seems vague and not well enough defined to measure the degree of success;
- - "for improved food security and nutrition, livelihoods, and resilience": we understand the logics to implement SLM/LDN for multiple environmental, social, and economic benefits. However, can you explain how you will evaluate these different aspects and provide the metrics for "improved food Security, "improved nutrition", "livelihoods, and "resilience?"
- "supporting the achievements of Cabo Verde's LDN commitments: we understand the intention, but the formulation is vague and not obvious to evaluate. Note: the LDN targets should provide a mean to better quantify what this project may achieve.

To be revised.

### Component 1

- Generally speaking, this component 1 related to the enabling environment for LDN monitoring is technical, including a review, tools, an action plan, a coordination mechanism, and capacity building. Two aspects are missing and could be included: 1) The political dimension of LDN is missing in terms of endorsement, empowerment and ownership by the concerned sectors (planning, financing, in addition to the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment) and 2) The sustainability aspects of LDN and the role of domestic and local finance could also be addressed, in relation with the component 2. Thanks to consider these aspects, if feasible.

- Is there an opportunity to build the capacity of local NGOs and CBOs as well to provide an additional support system to the direct and indirect beneficiaries?

- Output 1.1.2 on LDN Decision Support Systems: output potentially welcome, however clarify the non-duplication of past and upcoming efforts (LDN target setting project, GEF7 enabling activities to come).

- Same output: Please, also ensure sure the compatibility of the proposed work with existing methods and tools (PRAIS reporting system, Earth.Trend).

- Same output: the integration of climate variability and drought at watershed scale is particularly interesting. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

- Output 1.1.3: LDN Action Plan with voluntary targets defined for each target landscape: Please, clarify the added-value, coherence and non-duplication with the existing LDN country report (2019).

- Output 1.1.4: A LDN Coordination mechanism also reaching the municipalities is potentially welcome: However, please, clarify why the group stopped their activities after the LDN Target Setting Project closed. If the group did not continue without the support of an external project, can you explain how the situation will be different with this project? It might be a way to justify the baseline situation and cofinancing from the government to improve national and local ownership.

- Output 1.2.1: output potentially welcome. However, please, ensure a non-duplication of efforts with upcoming activities from the enabling activities (2022)

#### Component 2

- Wouldn't it be more coherent to have the same number for farmers applying SLM technologies (2,000) and those having access to credit and innovative financing (3,000)?
- If some farmers obtain access to credit and financing mechanisms and do not implement SLM and NBS, should they be covered by GEF funds?
- Output 2.1.2: Innovative practices for SLM are welcome. However, there is a long list of options in the result framework – some of them are disputable in terms of innovation and impacts on SLM: drip irrigation, rainwater harvesting, solar energy for water pumping. We are not against these activities per principle, but the logics and the impact in terms of SLM seems disputable, especially for solar energy for water pumping. Please, clarify, and correct.
- Output 2.2.1: We welcome the integration of gender issues in the formulation of this output, and we welcome the selection of priority gender-sensitive value chains for development.
- Output 2.2.2: The development of innovative and sustainable financing mechanisms is definitely welcome. However we would like a better estimation of expected results.

#### Component 3

- Output 3.1.1. Data and information on LD status and trends: some of these aspects might be covered by the enabling activities under UNCCD. Please, confirm the non-duplication of efforts and how the coherence of actions will be ensured.
- Output 3.1.2: such national system on soil information is in general beyond the opportunities proposed by the GEF: Please, clarify where the demand is coming from, clarify the baseline and cofinancing opportunities, as well as the sustainability aspects once the project will have closed. The part financed by the GEF should focus on the integration of LDN proposed in the output 1.1.2.
- - Output 3.1.2: It may be useful to liaise with PISLM and FAO team in the Caribbean on the work they will be doing in the SOILCARE project in the Caribbean SIDS on soil systems. There may be opportunities to share lessons and approaches relevant for a SIDS context.

#### **Agency Response**

- The objective has been reformulated accordingly: "To enhance climate-resilient food production and nutrition in productive landscapes through nature-based solutions in support of Cabo Verde's voluntary LDN targets".  
The proposed objective (and core indicators and LDN monitoring framework) are aligned with the country's position on the Agenda 2030, where the priority SDG targets and respective indicators have been identified and are being monitored by the respective national institutions and are gathered by the National Institute of Statistics. Please see Section 6 "Global environmental benefits", where the important co-

benefits are identified. Indicators marked with “\*” are monitored under process of Cabo Verde’s Voluntary National Review on the Implementation of the Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development. Distinction between contributions vs. attribution to the targets measured through indicators is at the core of the project. Given the lack of information on the data scope (precise geographic coverage and means of verification at the local level), it is not feasible to distinguish between project contribution vs. attribution at the time of PIF writing. These elements will be put in place during the PPG when the critical information is made available through, inter alia, household surveys, focus group discussions, national statistics gathering and analysis mapped over the target landscapes (to be narrowed down during the PPG).

#### Component 1:

- 1) The political dimension of the LDN in the country has been incorporated into the baseline scenario description accordingly. 2) LDN is among the highest priorities for the GoCV and is closely linked with the development priorities of the country. The country established the LDN Working Group (LDN WG) to develop national voluntary targets based on the global data shared by the UNCCD and specific national circumstances and development priorities (see Consistency with National Priorities section for further details). The country’s vision is that the LDN will accelerate the achievement of SDGs linked to poverty reduction, food security and nutrition, environmental protection and sustainable use of natural resources (see section 6 on envisaged linkages to the SDGs and co-benefits). The main objectives for the creation of the LDN WG were to a) define LDN indicators, b) Elaborate the action plan for the implementation of the LDN targets, c) Select LDN hotspots, d) Elaborate the vision for a transformative project in accordance with the UNCCD guidelines. Following the submission of the LDN target-setting report, the objectives for the creation of the LDN WG had been achieved. Given the success of the LDN WG, the proposed project is proposed to revive, redefine and expand the WG, supporting the LDN targets implementation.
- The project will provide an opportunity to build the capacity of local NGOs and CBOs and provide an additional support system to the direct and indirect beneficiaries. The role of domestic and local finance will be looked into during PPG.
- Regarding the LDN DSS, the LDN Conceptual Framework promotes a sound decision-making process based on the 19 LDN principles. The most relevant to the DSS are LDN Principles 13 and 14 on Participatory Integrated Land Planning and Good Governance, Principles 6-9 on mechanisms for neutrality and 10-12 on achieving neutrality. The envisaged DSS includes the global LDN indicators, and relevant national environmental, social and economic indicators while building on the national land use planning processes. Thus, the project builds on the relevant processes that have/are taking place, including the LDN TSP and upcoming UNCCD EA, to ensure sound complementarity.
- Please see the response above. Through our analysis of the LDN targets around the world, we note that while the global data has proven to be of critical importance to countries that have no national data, it is problematic to rely on them for nuancing LDN hot-spots. Specifically in Cabo Verde, the global data state that only 2% of the national territory has low productivity, and less than 1% has low SOC. Analysis done through Collect Earth (2016) and updated maps done for the PIF purposes show that the application of global data to local conditions is proven problematic, as also confirmed by the GoCV. Thus, the project builds on the relevant processes that have/are taking place, including the LDN TSP and upcoming UNCCD EA, to ensure sound complementarity and put important provisions to ensure that the country has sounds data, information, and tools in place to achieve LDN.
- Output 1.1.3: The LDN Action Plan will be closely linked to the LDN DSS (please see above). It may include local action plans and be linked to the national budget planning process (TBC during the PPG).
- Output 1.1.4: Please see above regarding the scope, mandate, and political dimension of the LDN WG.
- Output 1.2.1: The project builds on the relevant processes that have/are taking place, including the LDN TSP and upcoming UNCCD EA, to ensure sound complementarity and put important provisions to ensure that the country has sounds data, information, and tools in place to achieve LDN.

## Component 2

- Thank you for the observation. Both targets are now 3,000 family farmers.

- Output 2.1.2: Please note that the project field activities will focus on rainfed areas. The initial long list of activities has been revised accordingly.

- Output 2.2.2: Please, know that estimating expected results has proven difficult at PIF stage, as there are important information gaps. We expect that the PPG process will provide elements, although the exact targets may be known after review of available mechanisms is (1st PIR).

## Component 3:

- Output 3.1.1: We confirm provisions are made to avoid all duplication of efforts with other on-going processes (please see above). The processes will be coordinated by the re-instated LDN WG and guided by the UNCCD focal point.

- Output 3.1.2: According to the LDN Conceptual Framework, land-based natural capital is the foundation of the LDN decision-making process (avoid, reduce, and reverse measures). In addition, the soil information is an important element of the nature-based solutions. The demand for the soil information system comes as a result of LDN Working Group consultations and is reflected as a priority in the LDN TSP report.

- Output 3.1.2: Thank you for the observation. Indeed, SOILCARE provides important lessons learned for the rest of the SIDS. Initial lessons learned from the SOILCARE project in the Caribbean had been incorporated in the PIF, and the project envisages strong linkages with other SIDS platforms for knowledge management. SOILCARE will be among these platforms. The reference has now been added in KM section. FAO, as an IA on both projects, will ensure sharing of lessons learned.

## 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

October 26, 2021

Addressed. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

September 17 2021

- The cofinancing ratio is relatively low (1:3.3). However, we understand the difficulty to raise high cofinancing amounts in a country as Cabo Verde. If possible, to be improved at CEO endorsement.

- Please, explain the characterization of cofinancing from the government as “grant” and in-kind and not as “public investment”.

- We welcome the cofinancing in grant and in-kind from FAO, even if the amounts are limited, . We expect confirmation of this cofinancing at CEO endorsement.

**Agency Response** - Thank you for pointing out the mislabeling of investments made by the GoCV. These are public investments. The table has been updated.

## **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** Yes

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** Yes, this project will use \$2.5 million of GEF resources from STAR (project grant: \$2,183,105; PPG: \$100,000; Project and PPG fees: \$207,395 + \$9,500).

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion The GEF grant comes from the LD focal area allocation.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

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

September 17, 2021

Yes, the PPG is within the allowable cap (up to 100,000\$ for projects under \$3 million).

The future use of PPG resources is framed in the PIF.

Cleared.

## Agency Response

### Core indicators

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

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

October 26, 2021

Addressed at PIF level. to be confirmed at CEO endorsed.

September 17, 2021

- The project aims to reach the following targets: 5,500 ha of agricultural lands under SLM (core indicator 4.3), 4,000 ha under the core indicator 3 on restoration, including 3,000 ha under 3.1 (agricultural lands), 500 ha under 3.2 (forests) and 500 ha under 3.3. (grasslands and shrubs). Similar targets are included in the Theory of Change.
- Please, make this information coherent with the targets included in the result framework.
- Please, clarify how you obtained the # of beneficiaries.
- In the table B "indicative Project Descriptive Summary", the number of beneficiaries is included in the component 1 with the training of 100 local staff (50% of women) and "at least" 15,000 local producers trained, also with ratio of 50% of women. Under the component 2, "at least" 3,000 farmers are also targeted to have a better access to innovative financing mechanisms. Probably because these estimations are conservative ("at least"), the target under the Core Indicator 11 is 20,000 at PIF level, with 50% of women. We understand these targets will be adjusted/confirmed during the PPG, but please make the targets coherent between the result framework and the table of Core Indicators.

##### Agency Response

- The information is now coherent throughout the document. Thank you.
- From a total population in three watersheds of 19,374 people, 17,089 are family farmers. The project will directly benefit these family farmers (rounded to 17,000) thanks to investments made on land use planning and management. Furthermore, an additional 3,000 people will directly benefit from SLM technologies and value chain related investments, an estimate based on the average cost of SLM practices in

CV (USD300/ha). The remainder of the beneficiaries (1,100 persons) benefit from capacity building and knowledge management outputs.

- The information is now coherent throughout the document. Thank you.

## **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.

**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**

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed at PIF level. Please, complete the level of information on SLM financing during the PPG.

**September 17, 2021**

Yes, the environmental problems are well documented, using studies linking unsustainable dryland farming to land degradation and desertification. Some LDN baseline studies were updated in 2020 by FAO. We appreciated the use of climate risks screening.

One question though: Are there any barriers related to access to credit or finance or incentives to implement SLM measures and sustainable agriculture practices?

•

**Agency Response** Thank you for this relevant question. Indeed, the GoCV identified access to finance for SLM as a barrier. The details will be elaborated during the PPG, as more in-depth insight is required.

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

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

Yes.

**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**

Yes, the logics is explained and summarized in a ToC.

**Agency Response**

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

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

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

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed.

**September 17, 2021**

Yes.

- However, please, note that the Table A refers to LD 1-1, but the section 4 on Alignment with GEF focal area refers to LD 1-4. Please, correct.

**Agency Response** The inconsistency has been corrected. Thank you.

**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**

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed. Incremental reasoning to be strengthened at CEO endorsement to well justify the added value of GEF financed activities in complement of cofinancing.

**September 17, 2021**

- We recommend to include the Theory of Change diagram in the portal (some potential reviewers may not have access to the attached documents).
- At CEO endorsement, detail the role of cofinancing activities and how the GEF activities will be well articulated to them

**Agency Response**

- The diagram has been inserted into the Portal.
- During PPG, the role of Cofinancing activities and complementarity to GEF investment will be further detailed.

**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**

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed at PIF level. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

**September 17, 2021**

The project aims to reach the following targets of: 5,500 ha of agricultural lands under SLM (core indicator 4.3), 4,000 ha under the core indicator 3 on restoration, including 3,000 ha under 3.1 (agricultural lands), 500 ha under 3.2 (forests) and 500 ha under 3.3. (grasslands and shrubs). These targets will generate 249,456 tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e (6.1) and will benefit to 10,000 females and 10,000 males.

- The targets should also be considered depending on the value for money. Keep in mind that the targets should reflect indicators from the GEF grant + cofinancing, especially when there are "mobilized investments".

To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

**Agency Response** The observation on value for money has been noted with thanks.

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

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

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement: the use of participatory learning and community stewardship, valorization of local knowledge, mainstreaming of gender issues, sustainability of the watershed approach.

**September 17, 2021**

- There is a section on innovation, sustainability, and scaling up. However, we recommend adjusting the text and make all the work on LDN more prominent in the explanations given for innovation, sustainability, and scaling up. The operationalization of the LDN concept in Cabo Verde is the main interest for innovation (including the LDN decision Support System and the integration of LDN targets in planning instruments), sustainability (empowerment of national and local institutions and stakeholders, sustainable financing mechanisms), and scaling up.

To be revised.

- Is there a plan for sustaining the incentive mechanisms? Same question about the LDN working group this time around (institutionalization?).

### **Agency Response**

- The section on innovation, sustainability, and scaling up has been revised.

- Please, note that the main objectives for the creation of the LDN WG were to a) define LDN indicators, b) Elaborate the action plan for the implementation of the LDN targets, c) Select LDN hotspots, and d) Elaborate the vision for a transformative project in accordance with the UNCCD guidelines. Following the submission of the LDN target-setting report, the objectives for the creation of the LDN WG had been achieved. Given the success of the LDN WG, the proposed project will serve as a key accelerator to revive the WG for the objective of the LDN targets implementation. Sustainability measures for the proposed incentive mechanism will be analysed as part of the Output 2.2.2 delivery.

### **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**

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed.

**September 17, 2021**

Please, include the georeference data of the three selected watersheds: Ribeira Seca (Santiago Island) and Ribeira Vale de Garças and Ribeira das Patas (Santo Antão Island).

### **Agency Response**

The project-specific georeferencing has been included in the previous version of the PIF under the app developed specifically for the project monitoring. The app can be accessed here <https://bit.ly/3mIYVyr>.

Please, note the references for the 3 watersheds in table form in the PIF.

### **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**

**October 26, 2021**

Addressed.

**September 17, 2021**

Yes.

- The stakeholders operating within the watershed are identified (land users, municipality decision makers, agricultural NGOs and researchers), each with different interests and approaches.

- Important agriculture partners are identified, such as the National Agrarian Research and Development (INIDA), the School of Environmental Sciences and Agriculture (ECAA) of the University of Cabo Verde (Uni-CV), the Center of Livestock Development, a Unity of Agriculture Transformation and the Delegation of the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment.”

- We understand that a detailed stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during the PPG. However, some preliminary information on the stakeholders to be engaged during the project should be included to anticipate the Implementation arrangements.

- Consultations took place in July and August 2021, including on the criteria to apply to select the targeted landscapes, discuss the

feasibility studies, project beneficiaries, role and places of partners in the projects. A validation workshop was organized on September 9, 2021.

- A LDN Coordination mechanism is proposed to frame the future coordination of stakeholders (see the point below about sustainability).

**Agency Response** The stakeholders consulted during the PIF formulation will remain engaged during the project design to anticipate the implementation arrangements. This has also been explicitly mentioned in the PIF now.

## **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**

**October 26, 2021**

To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

**September 17, 2021**

Yes, gender issues are integrated in the project process and design, reflected in the formulation of some outputs.

Specific studies and assessments are proposed during the PPG to complete a gender-specific ToC, a Gender Action Plan, and better understand some social aspects.

Addressed.

**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**

The project includes the involvement of the private sector, but stays relatively blurred at this stage only mentioning the theoretical role of local SMEs and microfinancing actors, without naming them, along the value chains. For this reason, additional consultations with the private sector are needed during the PPG (agreed during the consultations at national level).

**To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.**

**Agency Response** The Agency confirms additional consultations with private sector actors will be conducted during PPG.

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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**

Addressed.

**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**

**To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.**

- Provisionary project arrangements are proposed with the Directorate General of Agriculture, Forestry and Livestock (DGASP) from the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment being the main executing partner. The operational capacity of the DGASP will be assessed (micro HACT assessment) and execution arrangements will be further defined.
- Coordination with GEF and other agencies is proposed (IFAD, UNDP, UNIDO, other FAO projects). Mechanism to be detailed at CEO endorsement.
- During the PPG, please check lessons and best practices from other GEF projects (UNDP, UNIDO), out of the LD focal area. For more LD focused lessons, FAO is in good position to take the lessons from other donors and partners on soil and water conservation, reforestation, etc.

**Agency Response** Points on coordination mechanisms and lessons learnt/best practices noted with thanks.

**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**

**September 17, 2021.**

Yes, the project is aligned with the LDN targets, the UNCCD NAP, and the NDC.

- Following recommendations from the Climate risks screening, during the PPG, please identify the key aspects and priority actions into the Disaster Risk Reduction Management Plan, the National Framework on Climate Services, and the Drought Emergency Plan.

**Agency Response** Recommendations from the climate change risk screening will be further addressed during PPG. 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**

**September 17, 2021**

There is a KM strategy embedded in the project design with technical, capacity building, and governance related activities (cf. outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.14, 1.2.1, and 1.2.2) in addition to the component 3 on data and information.

Addressed

**To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.**

**Agency Response** Noted with thanks.

## **Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

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

**October 26, 2021**

The text was revised in the portal, but not in the ESS report. to be revised.

October 27, 2021: the revised ESS report was received by email and logged into the portal.

Cleared.

**September 17, 2021**

We note that there is a risk certificate from FAO classifying the environmental and social risk as low. Considering that the project includes updates to territorial planning/land use management policy and law (potentially affecting livelihood activities, access to natural resources as well as potential conflicts related to land tenure) it would be preferable that the Agency provide some additional information related to its risk screening findings and or some additional information on how the project intends to assess/monitor potential risk in project development and implementation. Please, complete.

**Agency Response** The project risk certification has been revisited and now classified as Moderate. During PPG or in the first 2 months of project execution an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment will be conducted before any investment is made into the selected landscapes. Moreover due diligence will be made to the Reference Guidance provided.

### **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**

Yes.

**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

NA

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

**October 26, 2021**

Technically, the PIF is recommended for clearance, but the revised ESS report is missing.

October 27, 2021: The ESS report with the moderate rating is logged into the portal. The project is recommended for clearance and inclusion in the work program.

**September 17, 2021**

The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the points above raised in this review.

**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, please identify the key aspects and priority actions into the Disaster Risk Reduction Management Plan, the National Framework on Climate Services, and the Drought Emergency Plan.
- During the PPG, please, strengthen the incremental reasoning to well identify the added value of GEF financed activities in complement of cofinancing.
- Complete a gender analysis and the gender action plan.
- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis. Complete the risks related to COVID-19 (cf. GEF template).
- During the PPG, improve the level of information related to SLM financing (status, problems, options).
- During the PPG, confirm the innovation, sustainability, and scaling up aspects, especially: participatory learning and community stewardship, valorization of local knowledge, the use of multi-stakeholder platforms, mainstreaming of gender issues, sustainability of the watershed approach, national and local ownership...
- Improve the section on the private sector, detailing the role of SME and microfinancing institutions along the selected value chains.
- Confirm cofinancing, especially cofinancing from FAO, increase the level of cofinancing if possible.
- Confirm the targets under the different core indicators.
- Provide detailed maps of selected watersheds.
- Check the GEF portfolio in Cabo Verde for best practices and lessons. Check also the LD portfolio from other partners. Confirm the KM plan.

### **Review Dates**

**PIF Review    Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/17/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/26/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**