

Sustainable Management of Drylands in Northern Togo

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10416

Countries

Togo

Project Name

Sustainable Management of Drylands in Northern Togo

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/30/2021

Review completed by PM

4/29/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared.

Thank you for the revisions and responses throughout the review sheet.

JS 1/10/2022 - Yes.

1- Please note however that the GEF expects all new PIFs and CEO Endorsements to demonstrate a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent ?risks? and ?opportunities? relative to specific context for the project. Please refer to "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>). While we note note risks 24- 28 in the risk register, please provide a more thorough COVID risk analysis and/or other parts of the CEO endorsement request accordingly, and please include an elaboration on the project's contribution to a green recovery.

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

A COVID-19 strategy and action framework, including risks and opportunities, has been added to both submission documents, see Prodoc, p. 61-64; CEO ER, p. 51-54

Project description summary

2. 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

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared, thank you.

JS 1/10/2022 - Components, outcomes and outputs are in line with that of PIF stage, noting improvements on M&E and knowledge management.

However, the budget balance across components does not appear to be in line with GEF's mandate, which is to cover incremental costs to deliver global environmental benefits (GEB). Component 3 on livelihoods is the component with the largest share of GEF funding, receiving 38% of GEF project financing vs 33% of co-financing, when the theory of change does not articulate how this component contributes to GEBs delivery and the section dedicated to the incremental cost reasoning does not describe the role of co-financing.

Please see comments on the theory of change and incremental cost reasoning further down in this review sheet, and revise the budget balance across components so that component 2, which will implement SLM and SFM on the ground and directly deliver GEBs, receives most GEF funding.

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

The GEF budget has been revised, with \$300,000 shifted from the GEF Component 3 budget (BL 20) to the GEF Component 2 budget (BL12). As a result, Component 2 now has the largest GEF budget, with \$2,002,199, compared with \$1,779,720 for Component 3. A comparable amount has been shifted within the UNDP co-financing budget from Component 2 to Component 3. Overall co-financing, including support for livelihoods, has increased with the addition of a letter of co-financing received from the Government. As a result of these changes, Component 3 currently receives 32.4% of GEF financing and 36.6% of co-financing, see Prodoc, p. 91-97; CEO ER p. 2-4

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/6/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022

Please change the Government of Togo 6.55M grant from the "grant" to "public investment" categorization.

JS 4/7/2022 - All previous comments are cleared. We welcome the additional co-financing reported in this new submission. However:

A- The co-financing letters from the Government of Togo and ODIAE do not provide the time span over which co-finance will be provided. Please provide emails from co-financiers clarifying the time span. Please also ensure the email from the Government of Togo also confirms that their co-financing is for the GEF project ID 10416 (The letter provided does not mention the GEF).

B- Please clarify to what correspond the REDD+ project included as contributing co-finance from the Togo Government. It is not included in the *ongoing baseline projects for coordination* (table 2). There is reference in table 1 to a GIZ-funded "Programme Appui au REDD+ readiness et r?habilitation de for?ts au Togo (ProREDD)" but it ended in 2019. Please provide a description of the REDD+ project, including total budget, funder, timeline and links with the proposed UNDP-GEF project in the baseline.

C: The Togo Government co-financing includes funds to be mobilized from the "Programme d'Appui ? la Lutte contre le Changement Climatique (PALCC)" when table 2 states it is funded by the EU and will close in 2022, which means it would not be able to contribute co-financing for this project. Please explain.

JS 1/10/2022 - We note with satisfaction that co-financing has increased compared to PIF stage, but that the amount of investment mobilized decreased.

1- Please provide courtesy English translations for the co-financing letters from FAO and ODIAE.

2- Please clarify why BOAD's co-financing did not materialize during PPG (\$5,000,000 planned at PIF stage as part of the Project on Agricultural Land Planning of the Oti Plain).

3- Please clarify why there is no co-financing from the Recipient Country Government (\$300,000 anticipated at PIF stage).

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1. English translations of the FAO and ODIAE letters of co-finance, plus the new Government letter of co-finance, have been provided, see Prodoc Annex 12
2. There was a change in directorate at BOAD since the PIF stage and the BOAD letter of co-finance could not be obtained. However, the Government of Togo (Ministry of Finance) has provided a letter of co-finance of US\$7.05 million that compensates for the short-fall in co-finance, see Prodoc Annex 12
3. The letter of co-finance from the Government of Togo has now been obtained and included in Prodoc Annex 12

UNDP - 25 April 2022

The cofinance from ODIAE has been removed since the project closes in 2022 and negotiations about its extension are not sufficiently advanced.

With regard to the letter of co-finance of the Government of Togo, an email from the Secretary General of MERF has been included in Annex 12 clarifying the duration of the cofinance and stating the GEF ID. Furthermore, the email clarifies that a 2nd phase of the PALCCC project of the EU has already been approved with funding of 30 million euros for the period 2022-2025, therefore significantly overlapping with the GEF project and providing opportunities for collaboration in the area of sustainable forest management, reforestation and securing protected areas, as stated in the letter. This has been added to PRODOC Table 2.

With regard to the REDD+ project referred to in the letter of cofinance, the email explains that negotiations for a 2nd phase of this project are advanced, offering opportunities for collaboration with the GEF project. This information has also been added in a footnote to Table 1 of the PRODOC.

See PRODOC Annex 12, PRODOC Tables 1+2, PRODOC Partnerships section paragraph 148

UNDP ? 06 May 2022

						*	*
Land rehabilitation	NO	Degraded land		Agroforestry - default	0	D 10,000	D
SLM Crop	YES	Degraded land		Parkland	0	D 20,000	D
SLM Pasture	YES	Degraded land		Silvopasture	0	D 17,000	D

2c- Please confirm the correct restoration figures and revise to ensure all figures on core indicator 3/restoration are aligned throughout the document.

Table F has indeed been revised significantly upward in this submission from a total of 22,000 ha to now 59,000 ha of restoration, including 30,000 ha under 3.1, 12,000 ha under 3.2 and 17,000 ha under 3.3, in line with the EX-ACT calculation provided.

However, the text under table F still states:

" The project will contribute to achievement of Core indicator 3, Area of land restored, by restoring 22,000 ha of land (Indicator 3). This is expected to include 11,000 ha of degraded agricultural land (Indicator 3.1), 6,000 ha of forest and forest land (Indicator 3.2) 5,000 ha of natural grass and shrublands (Indicator 3.3). "

Likewise, output 2.4, table 7 and the Results Framework still mention 22,000 ha so that it is likely that the typo is in table F. Also, under table F, the text should mention 12,000 ha of forest restoration to be consistent with the EX-ACT calculations.

The rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 4/7/2022 -

1a- Thank you, but some instances have not been updated. Please correct under table F:

These core indicator targets are not precise

The project will contribute to multiple GEF7 core indicators. It will contribute to achievement of Core indicator 1 through improved management of terrestrial protected areas for conservation and sustainable use. This includes a target of 210,450 ha, as follows: • Oti-Kéran National Park (WDPA ID 2339) and Oti-Mandouri Faunal Reserve complex (OKM) covers a total of 179,000 ha (Oti-Kéran NP 69,000 ha and Oti-Mandouri Reserve 110,000 ha, including a core area of 41,914 ha, buffer zone of 57,386 ha, and transition zone of 49,700 ha , • Fazao-Malfakassa National Park (WDPA ID 2340) covers 250,000 ha according to its management plan (PAG 2018-2027). The project will contribute to achievement of Core indicator 3, Area of land restored, by restoring 22,000 ha of land (Indicator 3). This is expected to include 11,000 ha of degraded agricultural land (Indicator 3.1), 6,000 ha of

2a- Thank you but the start of the accounting period seems to have not been corrected. It still shows 2042 when it is likely to be 2022 or 2023. Please correct the portal entry.

2b- Thank you for the effort to capture more comprehensively mitigation co-benefits. However, given the relatively limited project interventions on fire control, please revise the estimates to significantly more conservative figures on what the project would be able to achieve in terms of fire reduction, either on the reduction in the percentage of burnt area, or on the total forested area under influence of the project, or both.

Please also include these mitigation benefits as direct (and not indirect) project GHG emissions mitigated. Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated are indeed only those attributable to the long-term outcomes of GEF activities that remove barriers, such as

capacity building, innovation, and catalytic action for replication. Please refer to Guidelines on Indicators ME/GN/01 (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Results_Guidelines.pdf).

2c- Thank you but the figures are still not consistent between the core indicators and GHG mitigation calculations, with likely consequent overestimates of mitigation benefits. According to core indicator 3, 6000 ha are to be reforested when the EX-ACT calculation includes 12,000 ha of reforestation from degraded land to tropical dry forest. Please recheck and ensure consistency between core indicator targets and the EX-ACT calculations.

All the rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- core indicator 1:

1a. Please note that core indicator 1 is binary, either the full surface area or none of the PA is reported. The indicator is indeed underlain by the METT, which assesses management effectiveness of the whole management unit, not parts of PAs. While we note that direct on-the-ground work will be limited to the northern part of the Fazao-Malfakassa National Park, please report, as was done at PIF stage, the full surface area of that PA under core indicator 1.

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF) ⓘ	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR) ⓘ	Total Ha (Achieved at TE) ⓘ	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)
Fazao-Malkafassa NP	2340	National Park	192,000.00	31,450.00			61.00
Oti-Kéran / Oti-Mandouri Complex	2339	National Park	179,000.00	69,000.00			34.40
Oti-Mandouri Wildlife Reserve	555703401	Habitat/Species Management Area		110,000.00			27.40

1b- The METT scores reported in the portal entry are different from that shown in the tracking tools provided as separate xls files. Tracking tools show scores of 20, 54 and 25 for Oti-Mandouri, Malfakassa-Fazao and Oti-K?ran, respectively. Please correct.

1c- Project support to other protected areas is mentioned in the PRODOC (including Fosse aux Lions, Galangachi, Sirka). Please clarify why these are reported under core indicator 1.

2- Mitigation calculations:

- 2.a: We understand from the PRODOC that EX-ACT was used to set the mitigation target with, as requested for GEF projects, a 20-year accounting period. Please confirm the accounting period is indeed 20 years and modify the portal entry accordingly:

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector ⓘ

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	2,546,742	6,480,033		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	4,278,908			
Anticipated start year of accounting	2040			
Duration of accounting				

-2b: The calculation assumes all mitigation benefits are derived from restoration and improved land management. Please clarify why there would be no mitigation benefits from reduced deforestation when it is an objective of the project ?

-2c: The portal entry states that mitigation benefits are derived from forest restoration (12,000 ha), degraded land rehabilitation with tree crops and agroforestry (10,000 ha), and from improved management of degraded crop land (20,000 ha) and degraded pasture (17,000 ha). However, these surface areas and assumptions do not seem entirely consistent with that reported on core indicators or with that used in the EX-ACT calculations.

The underlying EX-ACT spreadsheet indeed assumes restoration over a total of 59,000 ha, considering in particular that there is restoration from degraded land over 20,000 ha of crop land and 17,000 ha of grassland. According to core indicators, there would be "only" improved management within the same land use in these 37,000 ha, i.e. lower mitigation benefits than from land-use change as modeled in EX-ACT:

2.3. Other Land Use Changes

Fill with your description	Initial land use		Final land use	Message	Fire Use? (y/n)	Area tran Without
Land rehabilitation	Degraded Land	→	Perennial/Tree Crop		NO	0
SLM Crop	Degraded Land	→	Annual Crop		YES	0
SLM Pasture	Degraded Land	→	Grassland		YES	0

Also, the mitigation calculation includes 12,000 ha of forest restoration when only 6,000 ha of restored forest land is reported under core indicator 3. From the rest of the PRODOC (2.4.2), we understand that is is most likely core indicator 3 that needs to be revised to reflect 12,000 ha of forest restoration.

Please revise to ensure consistency between the assumptions for the mitigation calculation, the EX-ACT calculations and the core indicators, and consider using a more up-to-date version of the EX-ACT tool. Please also provide the EX-ACT spreadsheet as a separate document in the portal.

3 - Please enter the target for core indicator 11 in the portal entry, it is currently missing:

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female	76,800			
Male	51,200			
Total	128000	0	0	0

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1a. The current, full area of Fazao-Malfakassa National Park has been incorporated into the documents, including the core indicators, see CEO doc p. 8, 9, 12, 44, 65, 67, 85; Prodoc, p. 24, 65, 67, 73, 77; Annex 14.1, 14.3

1b. The correct METT scores, as per the tracking tools, have been uploaded into the portal and also reflected elsewhere in the documents, see CEO doc. p. 67, 85; Prodoc p. 67, 77

1c. Fosse aux Lions, Galangachi and Sirka will not be supported by the project. While these areas continue to be referred to in background sections of the document, references to GEF support to them have been deleted, see Prodoc p. 46, 116, 176

2a. Yes, indeed, Ex-Act was used (now updated to 9.2 version) with a 20-year accounting period (revised in Portal)

2b. There should indeed be indirect GHG emissions benefits, in addition to the direct ones, but these are difficult to estimate quantitatively. In this revised version, we have estimated the reduced GHG emissions from reduced fire frequency as indirect benefits, as well as updating the direct emissions through the use of more recent version 9.2 of the Ex-Act tool, see Prodoc, p. 24-25, Annex 14.1; CEO doc p. 7-9, 87

2c. The numbers in the Ex-Act tool match with those in the PRODOC but there was indeed an error in the core indicators which has been corrected. The direct and indirect GHG emissions benefits are explained in an expanded text in the PRODOC and CEO ER. We have also used the more recent version 9.2 of 2021 of the Ex-Act tool and have uploaded it as a separate document in the portal, see Prodoc, p. 24-25, Annex 14.1; CEO doc p. 7-9, 87

3. Direct beneficiary numbers have been entered in the portal

UNDP ? 25 April 2022

1a - The text under Table E has been corrected.

2a - This has been changed to 2022. Note that the entry for the PIF (2040) cannot be changed anymore.

2b - The Ex-Act calculation of GHG benefits has been revised by reducing the project impact on the incidence of fire to modest value of 20% of the current values. This reduces the total GHG benefits to 13,216,197 tons of CO₂e of emissions be avoided. Also, the impact on fire has been included in the direct project effects.

2c - The figures for Indicator 3 have been corrected and are in line with the Ex-Act tool.

UNDP - 29 April 2022

2a ? We confirm that the project will focus on highly degraded cropland and pasture areas and it has been a focus of the PPG phase to identify zones with an abundance of such areas. Therefore, the interventions will amount to land use change (restoration/rehabilitation ? bringing severely degraded areas back into production) and not merely to improved management practices on productive crop and pasture areas. We believe that the use of the 2. LUC tab in Ex-Act is therefore appropriate.

Parkland is a widely used term in the agroforestry literature, especially in West Africa and the Sahel zone, referring to landscapes with trees interspersed into crop and pasture lands. Typical parkland trees in the Sahel include *Faidherbia albida* but in the Sudan Savanna zone that is characteristic for this project the dominant tree species would be *Adansonia*, *Vitellaria*, *Parkia*, etc. These trees are compatible with surrounding crop and pasture uses and actively protected and managed by farmers.

2c ? Table F and the Ex-Act tool are correct.

Throughout the PRODOC and CEO ER, it has been clarified that restoration/rehabilitation activities will extend to 22,000 ha of highly degraded forest areas, 20,000 ha of highly degraded crop land and 17,000 ha of highly degraded pasture land, in line with Table F and the Ex-Act tool.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a 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

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 4/25/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/7/2022 -

8- Thank you, we welcome the inclusion of an impact evaluation of the livelihood interventions, especially on their contribution to the delivery of environmental benefits. However:

8a-Please specify in the ProDoc and portal entry the evaluation question that the impact evaluation will seek to examine, and the approach that will be taken.

8b-Please also reconsider the budget, as a proper impact evaluation with an experimental or quasi-experimental design is typically more expensive than \$50,000.

8c- Finally, please ensure the impact evaluation is designed as soon as possible, before or in parallel to the planification of the livelihood interventions to be evaluated. Currently, activity 4.5.4 Impact evaluation of livelihoods activities is foreseen only in years 4 and 5, when it should involve significant work on design at the very start of the project, data collection during the project, and analysis at the end.

Please refer to STAP's advisory document on *Experimental Project Designs in the Global Environment Facility*: <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/stap/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Experimental-Design.pdf>

The rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1 - There is a reference to Benin instead of Togo on para 35. Please correct:

- An interlinked set of environmental problems faces Benin as a whole and the target PDAs) in particular (see ToC diagram, A.1), constituting a loss of natural capital. These problems are due to a set of *direct and proximate causes*, which themselves are resulting from *root / underlying causes* (neither shown in diagram; see discussion in UNDP project document).

2 - We note the theory of change diagram and narrative proposed. However, the narrative does not unpack the causal pathways and most notably does not explain how component 3 dedicated to livelihood is to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs). The literature notably shows that there are no automatic links between livelihood interventions and biodiversity benefits (e.g. Roe et al. "Are alternative livelihood projects effective at reducing local threats to specified elements of biodiversity and/or improving or maintaining the conservation status of those elements?." Environmental Evidence 4.1 (2015): 22; or the USAID analysis (https://rmpportal.net/biodiversityconservation-gateway/projects/closed-global-projects/measuring-impact/mi-project-resources/integrating-livelihood-and-conservation-goals-a-retrospective-analysis-of-world-bank-projects/at_download/file?subsite=biodiversityconservation-gateway). Please clarify the theory of change that links component 3 to GEBs, providing supportive evidence for the underlying assumptions.

3 - Trainings/capacity building in outputs 1.5, 1.7, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3 : For the different trainings and capacity building activities planned, please be systematically precise on the scope and volume of trainings to be provided (volume is provided only for 2.4, 3.1 and 3.3), as well as on anticipated trainees, trainers and approaches to account for illiteracy. Please also systematically clarify how the trainings and capacity building developed by the project will be institutionalized or upscaled/replicated (e.g. training of trainers approach ? Training embedded in existing institution(s)?)

4 - output 1.6 : Please clarify what are the anticipated mandate and institutional arrangements for the platforms and how they would be sustained beyond the project's lifetime.

5 - output 1.7: Please clarify the support the project will provide to extension services beyond training. The PRODOC mentions possible creation of extension services but no corresponding budget seems to be set aside. If creation is indeed planned, please clarify the volume and how these would be sustained beyond the project lifetime. If not, please justify that existing extension services have sufficient staff to deliver what the project plans for them under outputs 2.4, 3.3, 4.4 and replication. We indeed note that "only an estimated < 3% of farmers in Togo have access to agricultural extension services". How many extension service staff are operating in the targeted landscapes?

6 - output 2.4: While criteria are well noted, please clarify what mechanism & partner will be used to deliver the small grants and tools to ensure fairness, transparency, cost efficiency and fiduciary oversight. Please also clarify the total amount budgeted for grants.

7 - output 3.1: Please confirm that oil palm (cf PRODOC table 5) will be supported only in mixed agroforestry systems and not as a monoculture.

8 - output 4.3: Please clarify how project impacts will be assessed. Is it planned to include impact evaluation of some of the interventions? We notably encourage embedding in the design an impact evaluation of the livelihood interventions.

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1. The reference to Benin has been removed, see CEO doc, p. 27
2. The narrative that accompanies the theory of change diagram has been expanded to unpack the causal pathways associated with Component 3, in particular the ways in which it is expected to generate global benefits. In addition, and as suggested in Comment 5-8 below, the project now includes, under Component 4, a dedicated impact evaluation / knowledge product aimed at demonstrating the efficacy of the above-mentioned causal links, see Prodoc, p. 28; CEO doc, p. 27-28
3. A quantitative, institutional overview of baseline extension services in the target regions has been added to the baseline sections of each document. In addition, a table responding to the questions raised has been embedded in both documents, see CEO ER p. 18-19, 26; Prodoc, p. 13-14, 34
4. A description of the mandate and institutional arrangements for the coordination mechanisms has been described. The output wording, as well as the activities, have both been revised in order to reflect these institutional factors, see CEO ER p. 2, 19 (Para. 30), 33, 67; Prodoc p. 14-15 (Para. 39), 40, 67, 110
5. The PIF referred (Output 1.2.2) to 'Government extension services established and operational at central and decentralized levels'. This had been revised in some sections of the initial submission but not in others. The revised submission reads as follows: '1.7 Government and NGO extension service services reinforced at regional and local levels.' This also reflects the significant role being played by NGOs in this area. As noted in Response 5-3 above, a baseline description of extension services has been provided, confirming that there is sufficient manpower to undertake the envisaged tasks and describing in greater detail the nature of the envisaged support, see CEO ER p. 18-19, 26, 33, 67; Prodoc, p. 13-14, 34, 41, 110
6. The word 'grants' has been replaced with the term 'technical support'. Civil society and NGOs will be contracted based on needs assessments and competitive bidding, to deliver the support in question, via a procurement mechanism to be established, see CEO ER, p.36; Prodoc, p. 45
7. Yes, we can confirm this. A footnote has been added to Table 5 stating that 'Areas shown are as part of mixed agroforestry systems and not as monocultures.' See CEO ER, p. 37 (Fn #55); Prodoc, p. 48 (Fn #79)

8. As noted in response 5-2 above, the project now includes, under Output 4.5, a dedicated impact evaluation / knowledge product aimed at demonstrating the efficacy of the above-mentioned causal links, with a budget of \$50,000, see Prodoc p. 56, 97, 125

UNDP - 25 April 2022

8a - The evaluation questions and methodology have been added in the relevant sections of PRODOC and CEO ER.

8b - Since the impact evaluation will be paid out of the M&E budget which is capped, funds are limited. The evaluation will use a professional consultant in combination with university students to keep the budget to \$50,000.

8c - The allocated funds have been distributed between years 1 (baseline), 3 and 5. The STAP document has been consulted and referenced. In addition, the authors have considerable own experience in field research.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/25/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/7/2022 -

3- The mitigation benefits have not been updated in the table, please correct taking into account the comments provided on core indicator 6 in this review sheet:

r	- An estimated 6,480,033 tons of CO ₂ e mitigated over a total
s	accounting period of 20 years (6 years implementation, plus 1
e	4 capitalisation).

The rest is cleared.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- Please explain the contribution of co-financing.

2- Please provide a detailed incremental reasoning for the livelihood interventions that are to be co-funded by the GEF, most notably the water supply infrastructure, the processing and packaging units, and the activities related to livestock farming.

3- Some core indicator targets will have to be revised in the table according to revisions made to address comments on core indicators.

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1. A detailed description has been provided of the contributions being made by co-financing, see CEO ER, p. 5-7; Prodoc, p. 20-22

2. The section on incremental cost reasoning has been expanded to cover livelihood support, as well as the specific investments mentioned, see CEO ER, p. 42

3. Done (see above)

UNDP - 15 April 2022

The figure in the Table 7 has been updated.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/25/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared, except for core indicator 6 targets that will have to be revised.

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared, except for core indicator targets that will have to be revised.

Agency Response

UNDP ? 25 April 2022

The number has been updated.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- Sustainability and scaling-up: While the elaboration is in line with the PIF and overall satisfactory, underlying elements are not adequately described in the alternative scenario . See questions in the comment box dedicated to the alternative scenario above on the sustainability of several project outputs, and on the anticipated role of extension services relative to the support provided by the project.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

The section on sustainability has been expanded to include reference to use of existing structures, as per comments above, see CEO ER, p. 46

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

JS 1/10/2022 - Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

JS 5/6/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022 - Please provide a brief summary of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, which is provided as appendix 8, in the portal section on stakeholder engagement.

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared. We note the Stakeholder Engagement Plan provided as appendix 8.

Agency Response

UNDP ? 06 May 2022

A summary of the stakeholder engagement plan has been included in the CEO ER (paragraph 110) and included in the portal section on stakeholder engagement.

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

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared, thank you.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- Please correct the typo in the portal entry: the Gender Analysis and Action Plan are annex 10, not 8.

2- Many indicators of the Gender Action Plan go beyond monitoring solely gender outcomes but are not included in the Results Framework or monitoring plan (e.g. Indicator 1.4: Number of extension services operational in target areas; Indicator 1.5: Number of people in targeted communities with access to extension services; Indicator 3.1.4: Number of PPP investment proposals submitted, deployed and/or extended.. Please ensure consistency across documents.

3- Please confirm that all indicators and all actions shown in the Gender Action Plan will be monitored and carried out, respectively.

Agency Response

UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1 - This has been corrected in the portal

2 - The Gender Action Plan has been fully revised. All indicators now match with, and are mainstreamed into, the project results framework, see CEO ER, p. 49; Prodoc p. 59-60 and Annex 10, Gender Strategy and Action Plan

3 - See previous response. We can confirm this.

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

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared.

JS 1/10/2022 - We note the risk register provided as annex 6 in the PRODOC, and the more detailed climate change analysis embedded in the PRODOC and annex 15.

1- Please see comment on COVID action framework in the first comment box.

Agency Response

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

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- Please clarify planned coordination with GEF ID 10291: Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program: Sustainable management of dryland landscapes in Burkina Faso.

Agency Response UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

The project will exchange experiences and lessons learned and, where possible, coordinate activities, with related projects in the region, in particular the GEF ID 10291 project ?Sustainable management of dryland landscapes in Burkina Faso?, implemented by IUCN and GEF ID 10688 project ?Land degradation and protecting forested ecosystems in Benin?, implemented by UNDP. Text referring to this exchange and coordination has been added, see CEO doc p. 58

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

We note the dedicated outcome, outputs and activities under component 4, and the timeline for deliverables provided by the workplan (annex 4).

Agency Response

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

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

We note the substantial risk rating, as well as the SESP, ESMF and Ethnic Groups Planning Framework (EGPF) provided. We also note that a Strategic Environmental and Social Assessment, Environmental and Social Impact Assessments, Ethnic Groups Plan and Environmental and Social Impact Management Plan are planned.

Agency Response

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

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared, pending final alignment of core indicator targets as per comments on core indicator 6 in this review sheet.

JS 1/10/2022 - We note the M&E plan provided in section V of the PRODOC.

1- Core indicator targets will have to be revised to address related comments further up in this review sheet.

2- Please clarify the means of verification for core indicator 4 (mandatory indicator #3 in the monitoring plan). The ones provided relate more to restoration than improved management and SLM. The means of verification should be tailored to discriminate SLM in production systems (4.3) from improved management to benefit biodiversity specifically (4.1):

Mandatory Indicator #3: Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares)	15,000 ha	37,000 ha	Includes both area under improved management to benefit biodiversity (5,000 ha) and are under improved production practices (32,000 ha)	Satellite imagery and ground surveys of natural regeneration, fire protection and tree planting activities and their success	Mid-term and end of project	Project M&E specialist	Satellite images and field visits
---	-----------	-----------	---	---	-----------------------------	------------------------	-----------------------------------

Agency Response UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1 ? Core indicator targets have been revised in line with above comments, see CEO doc p.7-9, 12, 65, 85, 87; Prodoc, p. 24-25, 65, 67 74-75, Annex 14.1

2 ? Means of verification have been revised to target specifically measures of SLM and (separately) biodiversity conservation:

?Ground surveys to monitor agricultural areas where practices to maintain soil cover, reduced fire use in pasture, and agroforestry practices are used (for SLM); surveys of sightings of indicator species (e.g. birds)?, see Monitoring Plan in Prodoc, p. 7

UNDP ? 25 April 2022

The numbers related to indicator 6 have been corrected.

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

JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/25/2022 - All cleared

JS 4/7/2022 -

A- Please remove from Annex B the responses to the review comments provided in this review sheet, as these are already captured here. No need to duplicate.

1a - Thank you, but the gender specialist budgeted for 60 months (half covered by UNDP co-finance) is not reflected in the PMU as shown in Figure 2. Conversely, the administrative and finance assistant shown in Figure 2 does not appear in the budget. There appears to be 60 days of local consultants but full time staff budgeted on finance and admin support. Please correct, making sure PMU description and budget are aligned.

1b - As flagged by email just after it was sent back in the portal, incorrect guidance was provided in the previous review. The 5% ceiling for GEF-funded PMC is \$259,437. Please thus revise back the GEF-funded PMC to a maximum of \$259,437. Apologies for the mistake in the previous review.

We note the adequate terms of reference linking staff charged across components to specific outputs (annex 7).

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- budget: According to Figure 2, the PMU is to be composed of 7 people (Project team leader, Procurement specialist, Finance specialist, restoration expert, gender expert, administrative and accounting assistant, livelihoods and safeguards specialist). We note that the team leader is combined with, and actually referred to as, "enabling environment expert" in the budget.

1a - Some staff present in the budget is not reflected in the PMU when they are supposed to have terms that are as long as the PMU (Knowledge management / M&E specialist). Reciprocally, some PMU staff is not reflected in the budget (administrative and accounting assistant). Please explain or revise, making sure the budget and PMU description are fully consistent with one another.

1b - Only two of the PMU staff are charged on PMC (Procurement specialist, Finance specialist). The others are charged on components. Please note that only when PMC is exhausted can staff be charged to components. Currently GEF-funded part of PMC is at 4.8% of GEF project financing. Before staff can be charged to components, GEF's funding of PMC should thus be increased to 5% (\$272,408) and co-financing allocated to PMC also increased (at least to \$520,934 to ensure proportionality between GEF's and co-financing's shares of PMC). We note the terms of reference for staff provided as annex 7 of the Prodoc that link the staff charged on components to corresponding outputs.

-The audit template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP.

Agency Response UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1a - Knowledge management / M&E specialist has been included in Figure 2, Project Governance arrangements. Admin and Finance Assistant (title changed to correspond with budget; see BN 50) is now correctly identified, see CEO ER, p.56; Prodoc, p.85

1b - GEF funding of PMC has been increased to \$272,408, as requested. Co-financing allocated to PMC includes \$375,000 from UNDP (shown as co-financing in project budget) and \$498,435 from other sources, for a (proportionate) total of \$873,435, or 5% of the new co-financing total (CEO ER, Part IB), see CEO ER, p. 1-4; Prodoc, p. 92-93, 97

Agency Response ? 25 April 2022

A - The responses have been removed from Annex B

1a - The gender expert has been added to the organigram. The Admin and Finance Assistant is budgeted under BL 51 for 60 months (5 years).

1b - The PMC is set at \$259,436 which is in line with the ceiling.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/29/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/7/2022 -

1- See remaining comments on core indicator targets and on the monitoring framework and address them in the Results Framework as needed.

The rest is cleared.

JS 1/10/2022 -

1- See comment on core indicator targets and on the monitoring framework and address them in the Results Framework as needed.

2- The targeted METT increase at the end of the project should be higher at least for the two PA with very low baseline METT scores (PAs of the OKM complex). Please consider at least a 20-point increase.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

1 - Done (see above)

2 - End-of-project targets are for 20-point increases in METT scores for all three PAs, see CEO ER, p. 67; Prodoc, p. 67

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/7/2022 -Cleared.

JS 1/10/2022 - Response to questions from Germany related to budget allocated to component 2 and to trainings need to be revisited to reflect the revisions that will be made to address comments of this review (request to further increase budget to component 2, comments on core indicators, request to be more precise on the trainings). On trainings, please be notably more specific on the involvement of local structures in the description of the alternative scenario. Please also note that compared to PIF stage, the GEF budget allocated to component 2 actually decreased by \$10,000, when Germany recommended an increase from the PIF level funding.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response UNDP - 1 Apr 2022

In line with changes discussed above, the revised response now notes the following:

?As compared with the PIF, the budget for Component 1 has been reduced by approximately \$93,000, while the Component 2 budget has been increased by \$290,000...?

And:

The project emphasizes training and capacity building both at central and local levels (see Outputs 1.5, 1.7, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 3.1, 3.3, 4.2 and 4.3), including the strengthening of government and non-governmental extension services (Output 1.7). Local government agencies will also participate and/or lead at all stages of the participatory identification and implementation of project activities in the field, thereby benefiting from a 'learning by doing' approach. An overview of baseline capacities is available in the CEO ER (see above, paras. 24-29), as well as output-level details of scope and volume of training to be delivered (see para. 40, including embedded table) and the involvement of local structures), see CEO ER, p. 79-80

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 1/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/6/2022: The project is recommended for endorsement.

JS 5/5/2022 : Please address the last two comments (see comment boxes related to co-financing, and to stakeholder engagement).

JS 4/29/2022 - The project is recommend for technical clearance.

JS 4/25/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the last remaining comment on core indicators / table F above, and resubmit.

JS 4/7/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit.

JS 1/10/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations