

Harnessing the Great Green Wall Initiative (GGWI) for a Sustainable and Resilient Sahel

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10634

Countries

Regional

Project Name

Harnessing the Great Green Wall Initiative (GGWI) for a Sustainable and Resilient Sahel

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

7/17/2020

Review completed by PM

10/15/2020

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I – Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

While the project description summary is on the right track, there are details for which we request the agency to engage in further discussions with GEFSEC, especially with regard to (a) how to bring the many deliverables into a coherent framework and (b) if the capacity development plan should not only be developed but also implemented, at least in part.

Further,

- o The implementation of the Capacity Building Plan may also serve to break the silos in the countries in the case the national GW agencies or focal points, GEF focal points, UNCCD focal points, LDN teams, etc, are under different institutions or Ministries.
- o Output 2.1.1: about innovative practices, before proposing a new report, a review of existing initiatives and databases could help avoiding duplication of efforts (see notably WOCAT and TerrAfrica).
- o The identification of a portfolio bankable projects was removed from the table B an output, but is still mentioned two times in the text of the component 2.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- o Regarding the Capacity Building Plan to break the silos in the countries: Addressed. A paragraph related to the context of multiplicity of Focal Points is now added in Institutional context page 10 and indication of start of the implementation of the Plan by breaking that silos is now included in output 1.1.2
- o Output 2.1.1: about innovative practices, before proposing a new report, a review of existing initiatives and databases could help avoiding duplication of efforts (see notably WOCAT and TerrAfrica). The review of existing initiatives and databases notably WOCAT and TerrAfrica) is now included in Output 2.1.1. wording (See project framework Table B) and description page 25.

- o The identification of a portfolio bankable projects was removed from the table B an output, but is still mentioned two times in the text of the component 2: Efforts have now been made to remove the mention of bankable projects throughout the CEO ER document.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

- Please provide English translations of the original co-financing commitment letters, in line with GEF policy guidelines.
- Please enter name of co-financer and not name of projects for Burkina Faso contribution.

10/12/2020: Discrepancy found:

The co-financing letter for Great Green Wall for Mali mentions that they will co-finance \$8.6 million in Grant and \$100K in-kind – these amounts are registered in Table C - however the \$100K are wrongly registered as Grant. Please correct.

11/02/2020: Corrected.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Cofinancing Letter: Informal translation is now provided

- The name of Co-financer is now included for Burkina Faso- See Table C of the CEO Endorsement Document

29-10-2020

The co-financing of \$100K in-kind indicated in the Mali Great Green Wall letter is now corrected in the portal in Table C as 'in-kind'.

Ref: See in the Portal the correction has been made

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Yes. However, we request the agency to engage in further discussions with GEFSEC with regard to the cost-efficiency of the project proposal.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The Agency has discussed with the GEF secretariat PMs and guidance were provided and considered in the revised version. The revised project framework now include initial implementation of relevant findings, plans and strategies. This has increased the project value for money.

Reference: Project framework, Section 1.a.3) Gef alternative and Section on GEF incrementality 1.a.5)

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Yes.

PPG is requested retroactively for this MSP in line with GEF policies and regulations.

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGL, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Clarification requested.

The investment is not targeting GEBs directly, only indirectly, which is challenging to quantify. Please clarify if any attempts were made to calculate GEBs arising from this investment.

The number of beneficiaries will be monitored. Please clarify how the number of 1000 targeted beneficiaries has been derived at.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The investment is not targeting GEBs directly, only indirectly, which is challenging to quantify. Please clarify if any attempts were made to calculate GEBs arising from this investment. Based on the review of the project framework which now has some concrete activity related to the start-up implementation of some of the findings, some direct GEB are now calculated. Ref: section 1. a.6) of the CEO Request

The number of beneficiaries will be monitored. Please clarify how the number of 1000 targeted beneficiaries has been derived at. The number of targeted beneficiaries is now 15,000 and it is clarified how this number has been arrived at. See Foot note 2 of the CEO Endorsement document.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: No.

- The baseline situation and the analysis are completely silent on innovation, science, private sector, investments funds, and existing banks (development banks, agriculture banks).

- The baseline is also missing GEF support from LDCF as well as private initiatives on adaptation (example of woman entrepreneurs in Burkina Faso producing Athieke – Faso Athieke- probably many other initiatives that are worth mentioning); Some listed projects are incomplete as there is no mention of the funding Institutions, the Implementing Agencies and the \$ amount,

- The MSP should highlight important efforts undertaken by countries for the implementation of GGWI programs and projects: For example almost all GGWI countries have established dedicated Institutions (National Agencies for the GGWI) in charge of the GGWI and develop and implement national and local programs.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part II

2

- On the baseline situation, the section on baseline is now improved in CEO Endorsement request and it now includes elements related to the Governance, Science, private sectors, national efforts, the Joint UN O/IBC-5 and funding for the GGWI –

Ref: See baseline section and project description of environment challenges

The scientific baseline is also been elaborated on. See Baseline section.

The private sector section is now more elaborated. Ref: Section 4 of the CEO Endorsement Request. Also baseline section contains now text on Private sector baseline

- On the issue of LDCF Baseline: A summary on the GEF LDCF/SCCF portfolio is provided in the baseline section and an Annex Q is included which provide information of these baseline projects. Baseline on national efforts has now been amended and made stronger: Ref section 1 a 2) on Baseline page 18 of the CEO ER document

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

There is a useful synthesis of information in the project description section (1.a). However, the logical sequence between elements of context, the threats, the root causes, and the three identified barriers is not self-explanatory to justify the interventions. With regard to the Theory of Change: the project should describe a in more simple terms a pathway of how to achieve change in the long-term; this could also provide a more coherent framework for the many deliverables (reports, assessments, trainings, plans, etc.). The framework should also include the expected outcomes (governance, capacity building, monitoring) so that the end product becomes also more useful for GEF to base a programmatic approach on it.

Private sector engagement needs further elaboration. The agency is requested to further discuss key considerations and expectations with GEFSEC.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

On the theory of change: The theory of change is now revised and presented in a very simple pathway. The ToC diagram has been modified in a more comprehensive and simplified way. Ref: Section 1.a.3) Page 28 of the CEO ER

- On the inclusion of governance, capacity and monitoring in the outcomes; This is now done in the project framework
- Private sector Engagement: Now it is more elaborated in the project document –Ref: baseline section 1 a.2 and section on Private sector Engagement Section 4.

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes. The alignment with focal area strategies and impact programs is considered adequate.

Agency Response

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

Slight revisions may be necessary after the baseline has been further elaborated and the Theory of Change revised.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The section 1 a.5 on incremental reasoning is amended to consider new information provided in baseline and other sections.

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Yes.

Refer to comments on the core indicators.

Agency Response Noted. The project baseline and the framework are now amended to consider direct and indirect benefits which can be generated from the project implementation building on available information and review of past and ongoing initiatives.

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

In line with earlier comments on innovation, a further elaboration is required.

The scaling-up also needs further elaboration, i.e. a clear and concise outlook, in line with a revised theory of change / roadmap.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The Innovation in section 1a.7 has been strengthened

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - this is a global project.

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

The PIF mentions that the "preparation of this project included a number of consultations and information sharing activities with various stakeholders" - please provide some further detail in this section in this regard.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Further details are now provided on consultation with stakeholders.

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

The information provided in that section is mostly generic. Please add a paragraph that summarizes in a concise way the completed gender analysis and what opportunities it may provide in the context of this specific project.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The Gender section is now strengthened with more gender analysis in West Africa by OECD and Opportunities provided by gender analysis in the context of the project.

Ref: Section 3 on Gender in CEO Endorsement document

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

Private sector engagement needs further elaboration. The agency is requested to further discuss key considerations and expectations with GEFSEC.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The section 4 on Private sector is now strengthened

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: Not fully.

1) It is noted that UNEP as the implementing agency will partly execute the project. This exception under the GEF policy is considered justified and hereby cleared by the GEF PM as the project is of a global nature and no national execution of the partner countries is deemed feasible.

2) The coordination arrangements with 5 executing partners are complex. The agency is requested to engage with GEF SEC in further discussion on those arrangements including a discussion of the possibility of an institutional framework that clarifies roles and responsibilities within the AU context, including the AUDA-NEPAD.

We support the idea to empower the PanAfrican Agency to lead execution of component 2, but need to make sure that the PanAfrican Agency is able to work with strategic and innovative partners (for instance World Resources Institute or Conservation International for innovative monitoring and science, the African Risk Facility at AU, Investments & Partners, Global, National and private banks involved in sustainable agriculture – see recent GCF proposals in Niger, Senegal, Mali, Burkina Faso...).

Please also clarify how the Secretariat for the UN Decade will execute component 3 and what the comparative advantage of this arrangement is.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

1. Noted with thanks. UNEP will put all efforts to ensure that the suggested arrangement works well and set foundation for a stronger GGW institutional arrangement and capacity development opportunity for the PanAfrican Agency and national structures
2. The suggested execution arrangement is based on comparative advantage of each institutions involved. It takes also into consideration of the role assigned to the African Union and PanAfrican Agency in the AU summit decision establishing the GGWI. The technical responsibility relying on the Agency while the coordination role to the AU. In order to ensure the coordination, the AU has established a Steering Committee which will serve the project as indicated in the coordination section of the CEO Endorsement request.

The role of the UN Decade in support of execution of component 3 is now clarified in the execution arrangement. Section 6: Execution arrangement

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
08/24/2020: Not fully.

The required UNEP project document should be a complete document with a table of contents and all required Annexes, it should also be recognizable as a project document (i.e. through a cover page) that it can be distinguished from the the GEF template.

Please also make sure that the appropriate document classification is selected when uploading documents. Project documents should be public documents to enable posting on the GEF website, or otherwise please explain why the document has not been categorized as public.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency had discussed with GEF PM and it has been clarified that for MSP UNEP project document together with CEO endorsement is not a common practice. Rather the CEO endorsement and relevant Annexes are submitted which is this case.

The appropriate classification for document during the re-submitting in the portal is ensured

20. 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 CEO Endorsement Request 08/24/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
08/24/2020:

Annex A.1: Project Results Framework

- o one of the three main outcomes still is a portfolio of projects (third outcome, first line; outcome 2.1).

- o The output 1.1.2 should include the preparation of the capacity development plan and its implementation (at least the first steps at regional and national level, depending on the costs).

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The comments have been addressed as suggested

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: GEFSEC's upstream comments: (not fully addressed)

Earlier comments, especially on the component 2 and the component 3 have been taken into account. However, the annexes have not been revised accordingly, and the result framework (table B) and the annexes (A.I and I.1) therefore include inconsistencies (see page 64, outcome 2.1, portfolio of "bankable projects" for instance). Please revise.

10/12/2020: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Efforts have now been made to ensure consistency throughout the CEO Endorsement document.

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - this is a MSP

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - this is a MSP

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - see comments on PPG request

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a - this is a global project

Agency Response

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request n/a - this is a global project without activities taking place at the field level.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

08/24/2020: No. Please address comments made in this review.

The Agency is also requested to engage in further discussion with GEFSEC on the details of the project design, such as mentioned in the review sheet.

10/12/2020: No. Please address one discrepancy in Table C mentioned in the co-financing comment box.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/24/2020	9/28/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/12/2020	10/29/2020

1SMSP CEO Approval**Response to Secretariat comments****Additional Review (as necessary)****11/2/2020****Additional Review (as necessary)****Additional Review (as necessary)****CEO Recommendation****Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

Context:

To incorporate lessons learned from more than a decade of investments in the Sahel, there is need to support the GGWI's vision to evolve and harness the region's vast natural and human capital. Despite the pervasive poverty and vulnerabilities facing its population, the Sahel region has a multitude of sustainable development opportunities. The evolved vision will enable countries to move beyond tackling environmental degradation to transforming key economic systems, specifically food, land use, energy, and freshwater, as well as implementing large-scale ecosystem restoration for a sustainable, resilient and prosperous future. Advancing this vision will require an approach that is underpinned by systems thinking, and will ensure integration of environmental and development priorities to maximize potential for harnessing synergies at scale. The GEF's experience with the integrated approach programs provides an excellent opportunity for achieving such a vision, at a time when countries are recognizing the urgent need for improved sustainable development, ecosystem restoration and economic recovery, while also demonstrating their commitments under major multi-lateral agreements.

Project approach and objectives:

The project will provide an analysis of lessons learned in the region over the past decade and identify and promote coordinated actions involving all major stakeholders and driven by country-specific needs and opportunities for advancing transformational change. The project will strengthen the GGWI as a platform for countries to engage with diverse stakeholders from IFIs, development agencies, private sector, technology providers, research centers, and civil society on the following priorities toward impactful outcomes, by promoting: (1) comprehensive land-use planning to better target and scale-up integrated natural resource management, including practices for landscape restoration and increased resilience; (2) policies to increase tenure security and rights of Local Communities and Indigenous People, including pastoralists for harmonizing land access and use practices and reducing conflict between resident and nomadic communities, as well

as private investors and local communities; (3) options to unlock market opportunities and innovative financing for diversified livelihoods of smallholder farmers and pastoralists; and (4) universal access to clean and affordable energy and low-carbon pathways for economic growth and development.

The project objective “Long term vision developed leading to institutional strengthening of the GGWI and mobilization of adequate investments for a resilient and sustainable Sahel” will be achieved through three outcomes: (1) The GGWI governance and institutional capacity roadmap, capacity development plan, and resources mobilization and deployment strategy adopted at regional level during GGW High Level Meeting; (2) Targeted integrated landscape investment and monitoring models provide GGW Countries basis for transformational changes that spur economic growth of multiple benefits for people and the environment; and (3) Relevant GGWI stakeholders, including donors and private sector, are capacitated and informed of flagship programs and increasingly willing to engage in the financial support to the GGWI.

Project results:

The project will result in: (i) Institutional and governance capacities of national GGW coordinating bodies and Pan African Agency of the GGWI strengthened; (ii) the large arid and semi-arid territories of the Sahel region become hubs of investment opportunities for transformational change and (iii) a portfolio of projects for long term investment identified and implemented funded by key donors and partnership.

In the long-term this will lead to land degradation neutrality and poverty reduction in the Sahel region achieved through the restoration and sustainable management of land and natural resources with positive long-term environmental results and a resilient and sustainable Sahel region.