

# Sustainable Management of Drylands in Northern Togo

**Review PIF 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**

10/12/2019

**Review completed by PM**

4/20/2020

**Program Manager**

Jurgis Sapijanskas

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

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

JS-3/25/2020

Thank you for the substantial revisions and clarifications throughout the PIF and this review sheet.

The project is still in line with the LD focal area strategy and is now also well in line with BD-1-1.

Cleared.

JS-10/17/2019

The project is not eligible for CCM funding since the GEF-7 CCM focal area strategy does not include land-based mitigation activities outside of impact programs. Given the amount requested by the project and the remaining STAR allocation of Togo, marginal adjustment would have to be used to fund the project as a BD-LD MFA of maximum \$6.7 million, or a purely LD project of a maximum of \$4.7 million. If it is decided to do so, please revise the funding structure and the project accordingly, retain nonetheless the mitigation targets as part of the project (table F) and ensure that the letter of endorsement indicates whether marginal adjustment is used.

The PIF is in line with the LD focal area strategy.

The project has the potential to deliver global biodiversity benefits and to be aligned with the BD focal area strategy (under BD-1-1 with biodiversity mainstreaming in land-use planning and improvement in agricultural practices). However, the PIF does not articulate tangible global biodiversity benefits, annex B does not include any core indicator target related to the biodiversity focal area and there is no theory of change provided to explain how such benefits would be delivered. An anticipated biodiversity benefit seems to be "reduction of deforestation and land degradation in PA buffer zones, contributing to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity, including endangered West African Elephants, lions, leopards and other wildlife" (Table 2, page 14). However, it is mentioned only on in a table on page 14, there is no corresponding outcome or indicator in the logframe (Table B), no explicit description of how project activities would achieve this biodiversity outcome and it is not clear to what extent project interventions will include on PA buffer zones. It also seems that the project does not plan to interact in any way with protected areas and their management.

If the PIF is revised with a funding structure relying on more BD STAR allocation, please make sure that the biodiversity outcomes, including core indicator targets under Annex B, and their causal relationship with underlying activities are explicit and tangible. Please consider:

- having more focused target landscape(s) around area(s) with significant biodiversity associated with a strong up-scaling/replication strategy.
- adopting an integrated landscape approach that includes protected areas (PA) and not just the areas around them as seems to be the case. The project could incorporate interventions targeted at improving PA management and effectiveness, as well as design its activities targeted at outside PA to also improve the sustainability of PA and their conservation outcomes, e.g. activities related to land-use planning (component 1) and on-the-ground interventions surrounding PA (component 2 and 3) . Please note that the BD STAR allocation can support restoration in very limited cases only, where it is cost effective, efficient and absolutely necessary to have direct impact on biodiversity of global significance.

## **Agency Response**

**Agency Response 20March2020**

The Letter of Endorsement was revised taking into account STAR funds allocated by the Togo Government to the GEF SGP and UNEP, making use of the country's marginal adjustment of US\$ 2 million (see table below).

While the PIF maintains a strong focus on LD through SLM/SFM and LDN interventions, in line with the LOE, revisions were made to strengthen alignment with the BD Focal Area strategy BD-1-1 (biodiversity mainstreaming in land-use planning and improvement in agricultural practices). This includes activities to improve PA management as measured by the METT by: i) improving land and water planning in landscapes surrounding PAs, including planning for habitat conservation and corridors (Component 1); ii) Improved engagement of local communities and skill building on PA management (Component 1); reduction of pressures through SFM/SLM, restoration and livelihood interventions in PAs and buffer zones (Components 2+3).

Annex B was revised to include indicator 1 (Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use; target 371,000 ha), and indicator 4.1. (Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity; target 37,000 ha). Biodiversity indicators were included and highlighted in Table B.

Protected areas and their buffer zones are explicitly targeted for landscape-scale SLM/SFM interventions in order to reduce deforestation and land degradation and achieve contributions to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity. This will include activities aimed at improving PA management and effectiveness, by strengthening capacities for land use planning (Component 1) and focusing on-the-ground SLM/SFM and sustainable livelihood interventions in areas prioritised on the basis of agreed criteria that will include ecosystem and biodiversity considerations (e.g. habitat cover, species occurrence, species richness, levels of endemism, presence of endangered species).

Allocation	CCM	BD	LD	Total
STAR	1,500,000	3,000,000	2,730,000	<b>7,230,000</b>

LOE	CCM	BD	LD	Total
GEF SGP	124,481	248,963	226,556	<b>600,000</b>
UNEP	500,000	0	0	<b>500,000</b>
UNDP	0	1,626,556	4,503,444	<b>6,130,000</b>

STAR used	CCM	BD	LD	Total
Totals	<b>624,481</b>	<b>1,875,519</b>	<b>4,730,000</b>	<b>7,230,000</b>
Difference	875,519	1,124,481	-2,000,000	0

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**

JS 4/17/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS-3/25/2020

Thank you for the revisions and clarifications.

Outcome 2.1:

-Please unpack indicator (ii) to reflect the target of 5,000 ha wildlife corridors under sustainable management proposed in the PIF.

-Please define indicators to measure biodiversity outcomes, in addition to threat reduction and METT scores. In particular, please consider unpacking outcome 2.1's indicator (iv) *"threats to wildlife resulting from deforestation and unsustainable land management in targeted PAs and their buffer zones reduced (covering 371,000 ha), as evidenced by increase in METT scores, including indicators relevant to deforestation, land degradation, and populations of key species such as elephants (baseline tbd during PPG phase)"*.

JS-10/25/2019

Addressing comments above will most probably require major revision to table B . On current Table B, please consider the followings, noting that addressing these would not be sufficient to address previous comments:

Please revise the formulation of at least of the following outputs: 1.1.1, 1.2.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.3. If needed, please refer to the OECD glossary on result-based management commonly used at the GEF. The outputs should be formulated to be very concrete, if possible quantified (X plans, Y training), and reflect the expected results from the activities. The formulation should help giving an idea of the value for money. A number of them are formulated as outcomes, expressing a consequence of outputs ("policy framework updated", "innovative SLM and SFM practices implemented", etc).

As an anticipated biodiversity benefit seems to be "reduction of deforestation and land degradation in PA buffer zones, contributing to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity, including endangered West African Elephants, lions, leopards and other wildlife" (Table 2, page 14), please consider adding a corresponding outcome, linked activities and indicator in table A.

Indicator 1.1.(ii) : Monitoring the number of sector policies that integrate spatial data does not seem an appropriate indicator for this outcome. Please modify so that the indicator properly tracks the integration of land degradation neutrality in parallel to biodiversity considerations.

Please clarify how output 1.1.4 on establishing a GIS- and remote-sensing-based system will be established with technical assistance only and no investment under the project.

Output 2.1.2: Please add biodiversity criteria in parallel to ecosystem service criteria to be coherent with the MFA-nature of the project and with project description (page 12).

## **Agency Response**

### ***Agency Response 02 April 2020***

Outcome 2.1: Indicator ii was adjusted to reflect the target of 5,000 ha wildlife corridors under sustainable management.

Indicator iv was revised as follows in order to place more emphasis on biodiversity outcomes resulting from deforestation and unsustainable land management: *Threats to wildlife resulting from deforestation and unsustainable land management in targeted PAs and their buffer zones reduced (covering 371,000 ha), as evidenced by increase in METT scores, including the following indicators:*

- *Reduction in livestock farming and grazing*
- *Reduction in logging and wood harvesting*
- *Reduction in PA landscape fragmentation*
- *Increased numbers of key species such as elephants (baseline tbd during PPG phase)*

### ***Agency Response 20March2020***

Outputs were revised in order to be more concrete and quantified (to the extent possible given limited data available at PIF stage). Output 1.1.4 on establishing a GIS- and remote-sensing-based system will require both investment as well as technical assistance; this was corrected accordingly. Indicator 1.1. was revised to better reflect the integration of LDN and biodiversity conservation considerations in policy revisions. Biodiversity criteria were added to Output 2.1.2 (now 2.1.3) in line with the project description.

Considering the initial intent of the LOE, its focus on achieving LDN through SLM and SFM, and available funds per FA, it would seem more feasible to incorporate biodiversity conservation targets as part of overall ecosystem service restoration and land degradation-related interventions rather than adding a separate outcome on PA management (also see response to Comment 1 above). We have revised the PIF accordingly, including by specifying the inclusion of Oti-Kéran/Oti-Mandouri Biosphere Reserve and Fazao-Malkafassa National Park under Outcome 2.1.

#### **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**

JS 4/17/2020

Yes, cleared.

We note the relatively low level of co-financing. Please consolidate during PPG.

JS-3/25/2020

Thank you for the clarifications. However, the amounts in the PIF do not correspond to those reflected in the answer below. Please confirm that the amounts in the PIF are the correct ones.

JS-10/17/2019

Co-financing is identified with a significant amount of investment mobilized. Please clarify the difference between the two lines related to the co-financing provided by UNDP, which are both indicated as "grants" and "investment mobilized".

## Agency Response

### *Agency Response 02 April 2020*

The answers in the PIF are correct, but we erroneously reported in our response from 20 March that UNDP co-financing would include \$2,489,740 in parallel activities implemented as part of the Ecovillage Project; and \$6,000,000 as part of the UNDP/PUDC Rural Enterprises and Sustainable Natural Resource Management Project. However, the Ecovillage Project has ended and the PUDC will be concluding its activities in 2021, hence the amount was reduced as follows: *UNDP co-financing will include \$2,000,000 as part of the Rural Enterprises and Sustainable Natural Resource Management Project in the framework of the Programme d'Urgence de Développement Communautaire (PUDC).*

### *Agency Response 20 March 2020*

Co-financing provided by UNDP was erroneously listed as being comprised solely of grants and investment mobilised. This has now been corrected in Table C, UNDP with the clarification that co-financing will include \$1,000,000 in cash; \$2,489,740 in parallel activities implemented as part of the Ecovillage Project; and \$6,000,000 as part of the UNDP/PUDC Rural Enterprises and Sustainable Natural Resource Management Project.

Furthermore, UNCCD co-financing was added, including \$ 189,230 in-kind through dedicated staff providing expert advisory roles on LDN matters and technical backstopping, including on the application of the LDN response hierarchy within integrated land use planning, and monitoring of progress towards achievement of LDN targets. This will also include participation in field missions to support stakeholders in applying the LDN approach and use appropriate tools and methods, as well as facilitation of outreach and knowledge sharing activities.

### **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

JS 4/17/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS-3/25/2020

Please correct focal area assignments in table D to reflect what is in the LOE and table A. LD and BD amounts seem to have been inverted in table D.



Table E is adequate.

JS-10/17/2019

The breakdown of the requested funding across focal areas does not correspond to that of the letter of endorsement (breakdown in tables A, D, and E). Please make sure that it is the case in the next version of the PIF.

### **Agency Response**

*Agency Response 02 April 2020*

Table D was corrected to reflect the LOE (the amounts for BD and LD were indeed inverted).

**20 March 2020**

The breakdown in tables A, D, and E, was revised to be in line with the new LOE, removing the allocation for CCM.

**The STAR allocation?**

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

JS-3/25/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS-10/17/2019

The total amount requested is available but the project is not eligible for CCM funding (see comments under 1.). The project can be funded provided marginal adjustment is used. Please modify accordingly.

We are however surprised that the project would use most but not all of Togo's STAR allocation. The \$0.74 million that would remain seem too small for Togo to engage in most type of GEF project using STAR allocation.

## **Agency Response**

**20 March 2020**

Kindly see response provided under comment 1 above, with respect to revised LOE, taking into account existing allocations by the Government of Togo to GEF SGP and UNEP.

**The focal area allocation?**

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

JS 4/17/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS-3/25/2020

Please correct focal area assignments in table D to reflect what is in the LOE and table A. LD and BD amounts seem to have be inverted in table D.

JS-10/17/2019

The project is not eligible for CCM funding (see comments under 1.) but can be funded provided marginal adjustment is used. Please modify accordingly.

## **Agency Response**

*Agency Response 02 April 2020*

Table D was corrected to reflect the LOE (the amounts for BD and LD were indeed inverted).

**20 March 2020**

CCM funding was removed from the revised LOE, and PIF now only focuses on LD and BD Focal Areas. Also see response provided under comment 1 above.

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

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

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

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

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

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

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

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

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

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

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

JS-3/25/2020

Cleared.

JS-10/17/2019

PPG is rightfully at the 150,000 limit, however the breakdown among focal areas is not compatible with the letter of endorsement. Please make sure it is the case in subsequent submissions.

**Agency Response**

20March2020

The breakdown among focal areas was revised in line with the updated LOE:

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country	FA	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					PPG (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c = a + b
UNDP	GEF TF	Togo	BD	n.a.	50,000	4,750	54,750
UNDP	GEF TF	Togo	LD	n.a.	100,000	9,500	109,500
<b>Total PPG Amount</b>					<b>150,000</b>	<b>14,250</b>	<b>164,250</b>

**Core indicators**

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

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

JS 4/20/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS 4/17/2020

Thank you for the clarifications. However, the footnote 4 has not been inserted in table B in the portal and might be too long for the table format in the portal. Please move the explanation on the surface area considered for the PA under table F.

The EX-ACT calculations mentioned in the PIF are not annexed. Please provide them.

Please note that given the nature of the project, mitigation estimates should be reported under core indicator 6.1 only (AFOLU sector) and not other sub-indicators. It seems the same estimates were pasted by mistake in sub-indicator 6.2 doubling the total compared to the 6,825,651 tCO<sub>2</sub>e of the answer below. Please correct.

JS-3/25/2020

The revised PIF is not entirely consistent with the answer below (e.g. not all 37,000 ha are in core indicator 4.1 but just 5,000 ha; mitigation targets were not removed). Please confirm the figures in the PIF are correct.

A target of 371,000 ha of PA under improved management (core indicator 1) is set with 179,000 ha for the OKM complex and 192,000 ha for the Fazao-Malkafassa national Park (FMNP). However, of these, only a total of 232,640 ha are referenced in WDPA (the Keran National park, WDPA ID 2339, 163 640 ha, and the FMNP, WDPA ID 2340, 69 000 ha). The terminal evaluation of project GEF ID 4026 reports that 114,560 ha of the OKM PA could be considered secured but no requalification decree were drafted yet, while 153,600 ha could be considered secured for the FMNP with the requalification decree yet to be adopted. Please clarify in the PIF the status and surface area of the targeted PAs and confirm that WDPA, if the discrepancy comes from outdated WDPA figures, will be updated as part of the project.

Please provide the EXACT calculations that are reported as annexed on page 6 of the PIF but that appear missing. Please recheck the mitigation target (6.8 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) which seems many orders of magnitude too low given the restoration targets provided.

JS-10/17/2019

Core indicators targets are provided however figures do not match those provided in the expanded table in annex B (22,000 ha of land restored in table F vs 59,000 in annex B). Please correct table F and/or annex B.

Please provide a core indicator target related to the BD focal area.

Please provide the EXACT calculations that are reported as annexed on page 6 of the PIF but that appear missing. Please recheck the mitigation target (6.8 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) which seems many orders of magnitude too low given the restoration targets provided.

Please justify the target number of beneficiaries.

## Agency Response

### *Agency Response 19 April 2020*

The contents of Footnote 4 were moved to section F of the PIF, on page 6.

The EX-ACT calculations will be annexed to the submission

The mitigation estimates were included only under indicator 6.1 as indicated in the PIF as well as in Annex B Core Indicators.

### *Agency Response 02 April 2020*

Core indicator 4.1 in the PIF correctly lists an indicative 5,000 ha as the area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (i.e. wildlife corridors), whereas 4.3 lists 32,000 ha as the area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (= total 37,000 ha for core indicator 4.1).

We added a comment in the PIF (see footnote 4 *Table B, Outcome 2, indicator iv*) to provide clarification on the status and hectarage of the targeted PAs: The total area of 371,000 ha is based on the following numbers: 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; with a core area of 41,914 ha, buffer zone of 57,386 ha, and transition zone of 49,700 ha; see: [https://en.unesco.org/biosphere/africa/oti-keran\\_oti-mandouri](https://en.unesco.org/biosphere/africa/oti-keran_oti-mandouri) ), while Fazao-Malfakassa National Park (WDPA ID 2340) covers 192,000 ha, as reported by the Government of Togo. Note that these numbers differ from those referenced in the WDPA, which reports 163,640 ha for Oti-Kéran NP and 69,000 ha for Fazao-Malfakassa NP. Also note that the terminal evaluation of the previous GEF-funded project on Strengthening the conservation role of Togo's national System of Protected Areas (PIMS 4220, GEF ID 4026) reported that 114,560 ha of the OKM PA could be considered secured while requalification decree had been drafted, while 153,600 ha could be considered secured for the FM NP with the requalification decree yet to be adopted. At present, there are four decrees awaiting adoption with the Government including Fazao-Malfakassa NP (192,000 ha), while there is no requalification decree for OKM. The project will address the discrepancies in the abovementioned numbers under Component 1.

The mitigation target was corrected as 6.825.651 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e. (The EX-ACT calculations were erroneously omitted from the submission).

## 20 March 2020

Table F correctly listed the total area of land that the project aims to restore (22,000 ha) plus the area of land that is intended to be placed under improved practices (37,000 ha). Annex B erroneously mixed indicators 3.1 and 3.2, and lumped the area intended for restoration (22,000 ha) with the area intended to be put under improved practices (37,000) to a total of 59,000 ha. The figure to be placed under improved practices has now been moved to indicator 4.1.

The EXACT calculations and mitigation target were removed in line with the revised LOE, and BD Core Indicator 1 (Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use) was added.

The target number of beneficiaries is based on an average household size of 8.6 persons, with an average land size of 4.08 ha per household (MALP, 2013). Project interventions will be designed to particularly support women headed households (on average 17.7% of agricultural households are headed by women) ensuring that 60% of targeted beneficiaries will be women. A more exact estimation of the number of beneficiaries will be determined through a detailed baseline survey during the first six months of project preparation. [Reference: Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Élevage et de la Pêche. 2013. 4eme Recensement National de l'Agriculture 2011 – 2014]

#### **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**

JS-3/25/2020

Cleared.

JS-10/17/2019

Please untag the project from the FOLUR impact program, the Good Growth Partnership, and the Food Security Sub-Sahara Africa as the project is not directly part of these funding windows.

#### **Agency Response**

**20 March 2020**

Level 3 taxonomy keywords referring to FOLUR, Good Growth Partnership, and the Food Security Sub-Sahara Africa impact programs have been untagged in revised version, while maintaining relevant level 4 keywords (e.g. sustainable production systems, small holder farmers, adaptive management, etc).

## **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**

JS 4/20/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS 4/17/2020

Thank you for the clarifications in the PIF. As mentioned above, footnote 4 was not added to table B and will probably not fit in the portal. Please move the corresponding footnote in this section of the PIF.

JS-3/25/2020

Please clarify in the PIF the status and surface area of the targeted PAs (see detailed comment in the I.6 “core indicator” comment box). A thorough description of their current management arrangements, acceptance by local communities, extent of illegal encroachment and resource use, and the extent to which they have been clearly demarcated is needed given the historical context surrounding these protected areas.

JS-10/17/2019

Please clarify what "structural knowledge management" (barrier 4) means.

Please clarify why unclear land tenure/ land rights is not considered as barrier that the project should consider, notably as it addresses land use planning and land management activities.

### **Agency Response**



## **Agency Response 19 April 2020**

The contents of Footnote 4 were moved to section F of the PIF.

## **Agency Response 02 April 2020**

Footnote 4 was added to provide clarification on the status and surface area of the targeted PAs (also see above). The background section was updated to include information on PA demarcation and management arrangements. The barriers section was updated to include lack of acceptance by local communities of PA boundaries, high levels of encroachment, limited support, and hostility towards park management. The baseline section was updated to include additional information on measures that have been taken towards improved community support for PA management and conflict resolution in the areas targeted by the project.

## **20 March 2020**

We have changed to word “structural” to “fundamental” to emphasise the absence of essential knowledge management processes as a barrier to enabling policy linkages, replication and upscaling. There are close linkages between barrier 2 on the absence of sufficient skills and knowledge, and barrier 4 on the absence of mechanisms to share knowledge. We added a sentence to clarify that “in addition to the limited levels skills and awareness that exist among stakeholders as identified in barrier 2, there are insufficient mechanisms to make sure that available data and lessons learned from local initiatives can be used to inform interventions and processes at a larger scale.”

With respect to the question on why unclear land tenure/ land rights are not considered as barrier that the project should consider, we agree that this is in fact a substantial problem. We added a sentence to barrier 1 to indicate that “(...) there are in many areas in Togo with weak demarcation and where land titles are not adequately documented. This hampers investments in land sustainable land management practices by the farming community as well as in limited availability of land for afforestation.”

As there is little information on the linkages between land tenure issues and land degradation in the targeted project areas, the project will invest in participatory mapping how land tenure affects land management in these sites, and incorporate findings in land use planning and sustainable land management activities. The results will subsequently be translated into recommendations to enable appropriate policy revisions, as part of Component 1.

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

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

JS 4/17/2020

Thank you for the clarification. Yes, cleared.

JS-3/25/2020

Thank you for the clarifications and notably the paragraph related to the achievements and lessons learnt of GEF project #4026 SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas. However, please clarify why it is considered that the context has sufficiently changed to successfully implement the proposed conservation measures in the same localities where it resulted in violent conflicts a few years ago.

JS-10/17/2019

Please select in table 1 the on-going projects that are directly relevant to the proposed PIF and explain how they relate to this proposal.

Note that GEF project #4026 SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas (PA), also implemented by UNDP, changed its target landscape from the OKM complex to the Fazao-Malfakassa National Park.

Please add the GEF SFM drylands Impact program and notably its Burkina Faso child project (Sustainable Management of Drylands Landscapes in Burkina Faso; IUCN) in the baseline as it shares many similarities. Please seek collaboration and synergies with the program and its Burkina Faso child project.

As there is, at this stage, no analysis of past or on-going SLM/SFM, restoration, biodiversity mainstreaming and nature-based livelihood projects, we would like to see scientific references relevant to the Togo context the project would build upon.

## **Agency Response**

### ***Agency Response 02 April 2020***

As stated in the updated baseline scenario section “[...] *While PA demarcation remains weak, the Government of Togo, with support from development partners has since increased its efforts to improve socio-economic development of rural communities, raise awareness on the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and engage local actors in dialogues aimed at facilitating conflict prevention, including in the areas targeted by the present project (e.g. see Table 1).*” This baseline scenario presents an improvement compared to the context that existed during the implementation of the previous project.

However, as this does not imply that the risks of recurrent conflicts have disappeared altogether, and the present project aims to *integrate key lessons learned on the importance of adequate stakeholder engagement, including the need for: i) substantial emphasis on ensuring adherence to FPIC processes; ii) extensive outreach and awareness raising; iii) facilitating dialogue between community members, local and national government representatives to enable conflict prevention; and iv) active engagement of local communities in sustainable forest/land/PA management activities while demonstrating livelihood benefits, in addition to addressing risks related to increased potential of human wildlife conflicts.*

To reduce the potential of conflicts, the project will be developed and implemented in a highly participatory manner, as described in each of the components.

Component 4 specifically includes the design and implementation of specific actions to ensure appropriate levels of stakeholder engagement, FPIC, and awareness raising, as well as conflict prevention.

The project will furthermore be designed and implemented in line with UNDP and GEF strict safeguards measures, as also indicated in the Risks section of the PIF (Table 4).

## **20 March 2020**

Table 1 was adjusted to include only projects that are directly relevant to the PIF, and details were added on how these relate to the proposed GEF-funded intervention.

While it is noted that GEF project #4026 SPWA-BD changed its target landscape from the OKM complex to the Fazao-Malfakassa National Park, the project did successfully implement activities in the Oti-Keran-Mandouri prior to the change, including demarcation of > 66% of OKM. We added specific reference to the lessons learned from implementation of #4026 SPWA-BD, and their incorporation in project design as well as in the Social & Environmental Safeguards Screening report. As recommended, we have added the GEF SFM drylands Impact Program with specific reference to its Burkina Faso child project on Sustainable Management of Drylands Landscapes in Burkina Faso.

We furthermore added scientific references relevant to SLM/SFM, restoration, biodiversity mainstreaming and nature-based livelihood interventions that the Togo project can build on (see footnotes included in Section 1a).

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

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

JS 4/20/2020

Many thanks for the clarifications.

We note that the project intends to distribute small grants from GEF funds. During PPG, please develop criteria and mechanism of delivery, ensuring that the objectives of the small grants are fully aligned with the mission of the GEF and the theory of change of the GEF project, and ensuring adequate transparency.

JS 3/25/2020

Many thanks for the substantial revisions and clarifications.

Component 1:

Please clarify in the PIF whether the project is to develop a training program for extension services and if biodiversity will be mainstreamed therein.

Component 2:

The project plan to provide cash grants. Please clarify if these will be funded through co-finance and the anticipated modalities (SGP?) and amounts.

JS-10/17/2019

Please provide a more detailed description of planned activities. Please also explain how the project intends to create "feedback loops to policy frameworks and decision making processes". The area considered in the project is very big (2 million ha) but the intended number, location and scale of sites within that area are not clear for many activities. The intended location of interventions respective to KBAs and PAs, which is crucial to determine the potential for global biodiversity benefits, should notably be clarified.

On component 1, please clarify :

- which policy frameworks the project intends to review
- what is the intended scope and scale of the "local land management action plans" and of the "integrated watershed and landscape management plan" and the relationship between these, and between these and the demonstration sites of component 2 and 3. Do these plans encompass protected areas? How will they "inform" land-use planning at the scale of the Oti River basin in practice, thanks to what institutional arrangements?
- are the targeted "government extension services" purely agricultural extension services or a broader category to reach "other land users" beyond "farmers". Through what source of finance will the establishment of additional services be funded given that GEF requested investment is less than 0.9 million for the entire component?

On component 2, please clarify :

- the scale of the demonstration of SLM/SFM practices that will be implemented at "site level". Are these the same as the 37,000 ha mentioned later ? What are the type of SFM/SLM practices intended for implementation.
- the intended scope, scale and methodology of the ecosystem services assessments (natural capital accounting?). Are the results intended to be used beyond awareness raising? How does these assessments relate to the rest of the component and notably its prioritization exercise?
- the type of biodiversity criteria that will be used in the prioritization exercise. Would for example contributing to connectivity between elephant habitats in the OKM complex be considered? To what extent KBAs and PA buffer zones will be targeted?
- the type of restoration planned and the role of co-funding for this activity that can be cost-intensive.

On component 3 :

- seems ambitious given the context, please clarify the feasibility and the scale of the interventions. How many land users, in how many sites will be targeted? Will the sites be the same as in component 2? To what extent PA buffer zones would be targeted ?

- please clarify the intended links with the Good Growth Partnership. Is the idea to coordinate with the KM part of the GGP ? Will the project focus on major international commodities ?

Component 4 is mostly generic language that could be used for any project. Please elaborate on aspects of KM that are specific to the project. Please describe notably how the extension services and coordination platform of component 1 fit in component 4. Please include biodiversity indicators alongside LDN performance indicators in the M&E and learning processes.

## **Agency Response**

### ***Agency Response 02 April 2020***

The section on extension services in Component 1 (last paragraph) was updated to emphasise that the project aims to ensure mainstreaming of practices and approaches aimed at biodiversity conservation.

Cash grants will be issued under Component 2 in line with UNDP's Low Value Grants Policy (2019), and it is anticipated that these will be awarded using UNCDF as a responsible party (tbd during project design). Grant amounts will likely be approximately US\$ 50,000 max per grantee (tbd during project design based on needs assessments; not exceeding \$150,000 per individual grant). At present, we have not been able to secure firm commitments for co-financing of cash grants. During the project design phase, opportunities for co-financing of cash grants through partnerships will be further explored.

20 March 2020

The wording "feedback loop" was removed, and more detail provided under Component 1 and Component 4 on how the project intends to translate results into recommendations to inform policy revisions.

In order to have the intended impact, LDN projects should be designed at large scale enough to properly apply a response hierarchy of Avoid > Reduce > Reverse land degradation. Implementation of LDN is typically managed at a landscape scale, considering all land units and their interactions and ecological trajectories, so that

interventions can be optimized among those units. As such, the project targets a substantially large area of 2 million ha. However, the specific location of sites remains to be identified during the project inception phase.

### **Component 1**

Policy frameworks of sectors related to sustainable land and forest management will be reviewed to identify gaps, weaknesses and strengths, and subsequently updated to enable integration of data and information for improved land use planning and environmentally sustainable land/forest management. These will include the Agriculture policy, Forestry policy, Landuse Planning Policy and Energy Policy.

Local land management action plans will be developed on the level of prefectures (4 prefectures in Savenes Region and 7 prefectures in the Kara Region), and where relevant sous-prefectures. Integrated watershed and landscape management plans will be overarching plans covering sub-basins of the Oti River focussing on the connecting landscape and watershed management issues. The land management action plans will include maps on existing land use, biodiversity, soil and land degradation properties, and make recommendations for conservation and development in the areas. Institutionally, they will be anchored at the administration of the prefectures and respond to the development plans of the prefectures.

The targeted government extension services will be purely agricultural extension services. Additional support to increase the scale of extension services (public, private and NGO) will be sought.

### **Component 2**

Ecosystem service assessments will be done using natural capital accounting methods. The project will explore the use of the Co\$ting Nature tool, which assesses the impact of human interventions on ecosystem services, and provides information for assessing consequences of a project or policy prior to its implementation. (For more info see: [www.aboutvalues.net](http://www.aboutvalues.net)). Stakeholders will be informed on the outcomes of the assessments, and training will be provided to enhance understanding of ecosystem services for informed decision making (with linkages to Components 3 and 4). Preliminary identification of possible target sites were done based on criteria including accessibility, present land uses, and potential for restorative measures (see Annex A Table A.1.). Participatory prioritization exercises will subsequently be conducted on the basis of ecosystem and biodiversity criteria to select landscapes for appropriate interventions. Areas important for biodiversity conservation (e.g. protected areas and their buffer zones, presence of endangered species, wildlife corridors, classified forests), will be given extra weight in prioritisation exercises.

The ambition of the project is to implement sustainable land and forest management practices in a total of 37,000 ha, including protected areas and their buffer zones. The implementation of those practices will be rolled out using a staged approach starting with pilot sites and farmer champions, followed by a second stage through provisioning of incentives (such as seedlings, tools, implements, training) scaled up to the targeted area. The exact location of the target areas and pilot sites will be determined during the initial six months of project implementation, and where necessary adjusted based on updated cost estimates and availability of co-financing resources.

The selection of appropriate restoration SLM and SFM practices and approaches will take place upon site prioritization. Options that may be considered may include improved agronomic practices that incorporate organic fertilization, minimum soil disturbance, terracing, water harvesting, agroforestry systems, and conservation agriculture.

Co-financing opportunities identified during PIF development have been limited, and will need to be explored in more detail during project preparation – including by establishing synergies with the interventions listed in Table 1.

### **Component 3**

The project targets for SFM and SLM remain to be confirmed during PPG and further detailed during implementation of Components 1 and 2. Interventions under Component 3 will be based in the same areas identified under Component 2 to maximise impact. This will include PA buffer zones.

The project will coordinate with the knowledge management component of the GEF-funded Good Growth Partnership initiative to ensure integration of good practices. While the GGP targets other commodities as the proposed PIF (e.g. cocoa, coffee, palm oil versus cashew, and shea), good practices in improving environmental and social sustainability of global commodities and potential access to global markets are likely to be cross-cutting and applicable across commodities.

### **Component 4**

The project will develop a strong Knowledge Management, Communication & Outreach Strategy, with linkages to M&E processes. The strategy should include: i) clear definition of target audiences; ii) specific actions per project Component to ensure appropriate levels of stakeholder engagement and awareness raising ; iii) promotion of gender mainstreaming and championing women as change agents; iv) extraction of lessons learned and good practices including from baseline projects, and packaging information to feed into extension services, policy advice; v) outreach and information sharing at local, regional and global levels using appropriate platforms and media (e.g. meetings, skits, posters, brochures, social media, photoblogs, etc).

UNCCD will support outreach and knowledge sharing with the broader UNCCD constituency, including for example through its knowledge hub, website and social media, as well as reporting on lessons learned about LDN implementation during UNCCD COP15 (as outlined in Decision 13/COP14 – paragraph 12). In addition, best practices will be shared through the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) platform, which facilitates global sharing of information on sustainable land use practise. Please include biodiversity indicators alongside LDN performance indicators in the M&E and learning processes.

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

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

JS-3/25/2020

Cleared.

JS-10/18/2019

The project is aligned with LD focal area.

The project is not aligned with CCM (see comments under 1.). Please remove reference to the climate change mitigation focal area.

The project has the potential to be aligned with the BD focal area (BD-1-1) provided the other biodiversity-related comments of this review sheet are addressed (see in particular 1.).

## **Agency Response**

**20March2020**

Reference to the CCM FA has been removed, while alignment with BD FA was improved (also see response under Comment 1).

**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**

JS 4/16/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS 3/25/2020

Many thanks for the clarification.

The GEBs are not totally consistent with what is announced in section 3 “alternative scenario” of the PIF (the 37,000 ha under improved practices are there 5,000 for wildlife corridors and 32,000 ha for agro-sylvo-pastoral lands). Please revise and also include the target related to PA management effectiveness in table 2.

Please revise the mitigation target, in accordance with the revision in table F.

JS-10/18/2019

GEBs will have to revised (mitigation and biodiversity targets) according to other comments in this review.



Please clarify the role of co-financing versus GEF funding in the project, in particular on the resource intensive activities related to restoration, extension services, open-access GIS/remote-sensing system and processing/packaging units.

## **Agency Response**

### ***Agency Response 02 April 2020***

GEBs were revised to be in line with section 3 (32,000 ha under improved practices and 5,000 for wildlife corridors), and PA management effectiveness targets were included in table 2.

The mitigation target was revised in accordance with table F.

### **20 March 2020**

GEBs were revised as indicated above.

At present, indicative co-financing arrangements exist with MEDDN, UNDP, BOAD, FAO, and UNCCD, which will contribute to maximising impact of GEF-funded investments in sustainable land and forest management, extension services, and improvement of value chains as well as in providing open access database services. Note that co-financing was revised downward from a total of US\$ 32,978,970 to US\$ 9,489,230 as the amount of financing available through grants from UNDP and BOAD was overestimated (the Ecovillages Project that was initially indicated as a source of US\$2,489,740 in-kind co-financing from UNDP ended in 2019, and the US\$6,000,000 investment for the UNDP-supported Rural Enterprises and Sustainable Natural Resource Management Project is nation-wide and was therefore re-estimated as US\$2,000,000 investment relevant to the area targeted by the GEF-funded project; BOAD US\$ 22,000,000 for nation-wide activities revised to US\$ 5,000,000 for activities relevant to the targeted areas).

Co-financing from MEDDN (\$300,000 in-kind) will include support to extension services. UNDP will provide \$2,000,000 in co-financing as part of the Rural Enterprises and Sustainable Natural Resource Management Project in the framework of the Programme d'Urgence de Développement Communautaire (PUDC), which includes establishment and enhancement of Planned Agricultural Development Zones (ZAAP), support to the development of rural entrepreneurship, enhancement of agricultural production through access to production and processing techniques, and facilitation of access to financial services. Co-financing from the West African Development Bank (BOAD) encompasses US\$5,000,000 as part of the Project on Agricultural Land Planning Project of the Oti Plain (PATA-Oti). This will include development of agricultural land, provision of agricultural inputs and equipment and development of marketing infrastructure, as well as extension services and awareness-raising.

FAO will contribute \$1,000,000 as investment mobilised through its Non-Timber Forest Products Promotion Project. This will include the development of a national programme for sustainable management of non-timber forest products in Togo, establishment of a database on African locust bean and shea tree, and strengthening of capacities of actors in the honey and shea sectors including in the areas targeted by the GEF-funded project. Investments from the private sector will be further detailed during project preparation and inception, based upon a detailed value chain analysis that will identify investors.

UNCCD co-financing (\$ 189,230 in-kind) through dedicated staff providing expert advisory roles on LDN matters and technical backstopping, including on linkages to open source and open data platforms for sharing and publishing georeferenced information such as geonode, Trend Earth and Collect Earth.

As outlined in Table 1, additional opportunities exist for leveraging co-financing through synergies that have not yet been fully explored. In addition, recommendations resulting from Togo's LDN target setting process include ambitious restoration goals for which the government is currently mobilising funding (see Table 3, p. 17 in République du Togo (2018). Programme de definition de cibles nationales de la neutralite en matière de degradation des terres). During project development, potential synergies with these initiatives will be further explored.

**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**

JS 4/20/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS 4/17/2020

Please see comment on table F.

JS 3/25/2020

Thank you for the clarifications.

Please recheck the mitigation target (6.8 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) which seems many orders of magnitude too low given the restoration targets provided.

JS-10/18/2019

Please recheck the mitigation target (6.8 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) which seems many orders of magnitude too low given the restoration targets provided.

Please provide a target for biodiversity GEB.

The target for land restoration appears very ambitious given the GEF funding requested, please clarify the feasibility within the time and resource of the project, including the role of co-financing.

## Agency Response

Agency Response 19 April 2020

The contents of Footnote 4 were moved to section F of the PIF.

### *Agency Response 02 April 2020*

The mitigation target was corrected as 6.825.651 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e.

**20 March 2020**

The mitigation target was removed in line with the new LOE. The biodiversity GEB is included in core indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity). While we understand that strictly speaking, core indicator 4 excludes Protected Areas, in this specific case biodiversity benefits are expected indirectly from including PAs in a landscape approach towards SLM and SFM.

The targets of 22,000 ha of land restored, and 37,000 ha of land under improved practices are in line with Togo's ambitions towards achieving LDN. With US\$ 1,712,199 of investments in sustainable land and forest management interventions at site level (Component 2) in addition to US\$ 2,318,156 of investments geared towards sustainable nature-based livelihoods (= US\$ 4,030,355 in total) the targets should be achievable, especially when implemented in synergy with investments from the Government, UNDP, BOAD, FAO and UNCCD (also see response to comment 5 on incremental cost reasoning). However, during project development, targets may be readjusted upon confirmation of target sites and co-financing commitments.

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 3/25/2020

Cleared.

*Comment for comment box "Project/Program Map and Coordinates" which is experiencing technical issues:*

Many thanks for the upgraded maps and indicative site locations.

Cleared.

JS-10/18/2019

On sustainability, please describe the project's strategy for achieving the institutionalization of the training and tools it would provide.

On up-scaling, please elaborate on the project's strategy beyond component 4 (KM management).

## **Agency Response**

**20March2020**

Project development and implementation will take place in a highly participatory manner, engaging stakeholders at all levels to ensure that the project reflects their interests and needs in the best possible way. This will facilitate ownership, and contribute to longer-term sustainability of the investments made. The development of land management action plans will be done in line with local development plans, and in close collaboration with the administration of the targeted prefectures, to ensure that they are institutionally anchored at the appropriate level. The project will facilitate systems to enable widespread adoption of tools and innovations, and encourage institutionalisation. This will include embedding knowledge into institutional memories by depositing information in appropriate form, and by engaging relevant actors in training and learning opportunities. Appropriate forms of information dissemination to encourage learning and institutional uptake will depend on the targeted audience (for instance, and will be further explored under each project component, with linkages to knowledge management and communication strategies designed under Component 4.

Extension services will play an important role in enabling replication and upscaling at the local and national level (Component 1 and 2). Linkages with open data platforms for sharing and publishing georeferenced information (Component 1), and coordination with the knowledge management component of the Good Growth Partnership (Component 3) will contribute to enabling upscaling at the global level.

### **20March2020 for Project/Program Map and Coordinates (as the below window doesn't show the responses)**

Preliminary pilot intervention sites were selected within the two northern provinces targeted by the project. A map and overview of the sites was added to Annex A. This selection is preliminary, and will need to be further evaluated during project preparation and the initial stages of project implementation, based on agreed criteria, including those related to biodiversity conservation targets. Kindly also note that we are aware the map does not indicate the location of protected areas within the targeted landscapes, and we would be keen to adjust this if recommended.

### **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**

JS 4/17/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS-10/17/2019

A map is provided. Please clarify to the extent possible intended demonstration sites within the big targeted areas (see comment 3.) and provide coordinates.

## **Agency Response**

### **Stakeholders**

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

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

JS 4/17/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS 3/25/2020

We note that the role of Ministries seems prominent. It seems there were very little community-level consultations, if any, at this stage when the project plans to adopt a participatory approach and that substantial risk are identified for tensions and upheaval among local communities, particularly around protected areas. Please clarify if community-level consultations have been made during PIF preparation, or how their willingness to engage in the project as proposed has been assessed.

Please also clarify the local technical partners that are seen as key for the project, e.g. CTOP (Coordination Togolaise des Organisations Paysannes et de Producteurs Agricoles).

AVSF and VSF Switzerland are international partners with experience with similar projects in Togo probably worth consulting.

JS-10/18/2019

Please provide information on the stakeholders that have been consulted to date (beyond the categories).

Please add relevant protected area managers to the list of stakeholders.

## Agency Response

### *Agency Response 02 April 2020*

While extensive stakeholder consultations were conducted during the LDN target setting process that informed the formulation of this PIF (as indicated in Section 2 - Stakeholders), we acknowledge that the level of engagement with local communities during the design of the PIF itself has been fairly limited, although the consultants who supported the development of the PIF did engage with representatives of local communities in the targeted areas to discuss the intended outcomes of the proposed project and seek inputs to inform its design (a statement was added to Section 2 to highlight this).

As also specified in Section 2:” *More detailed stakeholder analysis and engagement will take place during the project preparation phase, when roles and contributions will be further clarified and agreed, and a stakeholder engagement plan will be prepared to guide a participatory process of project development, implementation, lesson learning and knowledge sharing.*”

In recognizing the substantial risks associated with insufficient stakeholder engagement and support for the project at the local community level, lessons learned from the previous GEF-funded protected area project in Togo (PIMS 4220, GEF ID 4026) will be taken into account during development of the present project, including the need for FPIC while adhering to UNDP and GEF safeguards measures (also see assessment and management measures proposed in the Social & Environmental Screening Report, annexed to the PIF).

We added information to Table 3 to clarify the anticipated roles and responsibilities of local technical partners such as CTOP (Support to awareness raising and introduction of SLM, SFM, and LDN concepts at the national and sub-regional level; Promotion of environmentally and socio-economically sustainable technologies and value chains; Support to processes aimed at achieving solidarity and reducing potential for conflict at the local farming community level; Fostering of consultations, knowledge sharing and cooperation), as well as Agronomes and Vétérinaires Sans Frontières (AVSF and VSF) Switzerland.

### **20 March 2020**

Extensive stakeholder consultations were conducted during the LDN target setting process in 2017, which informed the formulation of this PIF. During PIF development, the UNCCD Focal Point and other staff at the Directorate of Forest Resources, Department of Agriculture, Department of Environment, Department of Zoology of the University of Lomé, Department of Geography of the University of Lomé, Regional Directorate of the Savanah Environment, Regional Directorate of the Kara Environment, Head of the Cajou Espoir Society, General Director of the Société Togolaise de Karité, and market gardening groups of the Kara Region were consulted.

More detailed stakeholder analysis and engagement will take place during the project preparation phase, when roles and contributions will be further clarified and agreed, and a stakeholder engagement plan will be prepared to guide a participatory process of project development, implementation, lesson learning and knowledge sharing.

We added wardens of the protected areas to the list of stakeholders (Table 3).

#### **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**

JS 3/25/2020

Cleared.

JS-10/22/2019

We note the willingness to mainstream gender issues and the fact that the project will carry out a gender gap analysis during PPG and develop a gender action plan with associated indicators to ensure gender considerations are fully integrated in project implementation. Gender is however not yet addressed explicitly in project activities and language related to gender is mostly generic and not specific to the project. Please correct.

#### **Agency Response**

**20March2020**

Table B includes gender segregated indicators as well as specific reference to the need for mainstreaming of gender issues, and gender considerations are integrated in project components to the extent possible.

However, without having undergone a full gap analysis and gender action plan development, language inherently remains rather generic. The Gender Gap Assessment and Gender Action Plan will ensure systematic integration of gender-mainstreaming recommendations into project activities and collection of sex-disaggregated monitoring data for relevant indicators.

#### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

JS-10/18/2019

Yes. cleared.

**Agency Response****Risks**

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

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

JS 4/20/2020

Yes, cleared.

We note that the project has an overall high-risk rating, including highly significant risks of physical and economic displacement, conflicting claims on natural resources by different ethnic groups, conflict / violence, and violation of international labor standard.

Please ensure that final project submission adheres to the GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards. By the time of CEO endorsement please ensure that UNDP's safeguard policies are applied in full, including FPIC, and provide the documentation as an annex.

JS 4/17/2020

Please ensure the PIF reflects the most important aspects of the annexed Social & Environmental Risk Screening report. The PIF should notably include all the risks that are considered significant and probable. Risks related to ethnic dimensions and international labor standards are reported as significant and highly probable in the annexed document and therefore should be included in the PIF.

JS 3/25/2020



We note that the overall risk rating of the project is high. We especially note that the risks of upheaval and of displacements, both economic and physical, are rated as high.

Please clarify in the PIF these risks assessment and mitigation measures proposed beyond FPIC. In particular, please explain :

- why it is considered that the context has sufficiently changed to successfully implement the proposed conservation measures in the same localities where it resulted in violent conflicts a few years ago under the GEF-4 project #4026 (SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas);
- Why displacement, both economic and physical, are considered to be a possible outcome of the project, which is not set to create new protected areas.

JS-10/18/2019

Please provide the preliminary UNDP Social & Environmental Risk Screening report that is announced annexed to the PIF but seems to be missing.

The project intends to work in part in the OKM complex, the same area as GEF project #4026 (SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas (PA), also implemented by UNDP) intended to work in the first place. The latter project had to change its target landscape because of the opposition of some local communities to biodiversity conservation-related interventions. While the risk of general social / political upheaval is addressed in the PIF, please also address risk of more specific opposition to conservation measures and explain why the current project is expected to be able to proceed in the regions where the previous project was not able to.

Please also confirm that human-wildlife conflicts and land tenure/land right conflicts have been considered and clarify why it is not deemed an issue for the project's implementation.

## **Agency Response**

### ***Agency Response 19 April 2020***

All moderate and high risks identified in the SESP have been included in the Risks Table in the PIF (with cross-reference to the SESP) and have been briefly summarized in the narrative under the paragraph headed: Risks in the body of the PIF

### ***Agency Response 02 April 2020***

Kindly also see response to comment 2 above (Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?) related to the question if the context has sufficiently changed to successfully implement the proposed interventions. The UNDP-supported project on establishing a “Plateforme de dialogue

communautaire pour le développement local et la cohésion sociale” (platform for community dialogue for local development and social cohesion) is presently being implemented successfully and intended to reduce the potential for local conflicts substantially in the near future.

As identified in the Social & Environmental Screening Report (SES) attached to the PIF, there is a risk for economic and physical displacement associated with the fact that the project aims to restore degraded lands and forests including in Protected Areas and buffer zones that are presently being accessed by farming- and agro-pastoralist communities for use of natural resources (forest resources, arable land, grazing areas for livestock). This explains why economical and/or physical displacement are considered to be a possible outcome of the project, even though its not set to create new protected areas.

## **20 March 2020**

The UNDP Social & Environmental Risk Screening report that was prepared during initial draft PIF and erroneously omitted during uploading to the GEF Portal. The SESP report will be available upon resubmission of the PIF.

In the SESP report, the risk that the project would exacerbate conflicts among local communities and individuals is considered substantial. The report emphasises the need to ensure that lessons learnt and recommendations from the implementation and suspension of SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas (GEF ID 4026PIMS 4420), including on the importance of ensuring adherence to FPIC processes and active stakeholder engagement are integrated in project design (See SESP report section on Principle 1 Human Rights - Risk 9).

The SESP report also details risks associated with land tenure / land rights and human-wildlife conflicts. (see section on Principle 1 Human Rights; Principle 3 Environmental Sustainability). A detailed Environmental & Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) will be undertaken and an Environmental & Social Impact Management Plan (ESMP) prepared during the first six months of project implementation to further refine risk identification, mitigation and management strategies, as well as to establish a system for monitoring risks. Based on the ESIA findings, the ESMP might include a Livelihood Action Plan (and other such plans as determined necessary), which will take into account risks associated with human-wildlife conflict.

## **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**

JS 4/20/2020

Yes, cleared.

JS - 3/25/2020

Please also coordinate with the project GEF ID 10230 - CI - *Strengthening Land Degradation Neutrality data and decision-making through free and open access platforms*, which correspond to the second phase of Trends.Earth that the project will use.

JS-10/25/2019

Please make the distinction between Implementing and Executing partners in a GEF context. UNDP would be the GEF implementing Agency, but national partners such as the Ministry of Environment are executing partners.

Please correct the name of the Ministry of Environment, which differs to that on page 1 and clarify the project coordination arrangements. Who would be included on the project steering committee.

Please be more specific on the collaboration planned with other projects, and notably with the GEF SFM drylands Impact program and its Burkina Faso child project.

We note that the role of UNDP is not made explicit. We are not approving any arrangement at this stage and will reserve the right to examine any such arrangements during the PPG phase and at CEO endorsement. As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF would in no way endorse any alternative execution arrangement.

## **Agency Response**

**20March2020**

Project coordination mechanisms were revised, and the distinction between Implementing and Executing Partners made clear in the GEF context. UNDP will perform the quality assurance role and supports the Project Steering Committee and Project Management Unit by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. During the project preparation phase, the option to engage a third party will be further assessed.

The Project Steering Committee will include representatives of the Ministries of Environment, Agriculture, Development Planning, Economy and Finance, civil society actors, private sector actors involved in value chains of commodities targeted by the project, protected area managers, and representatives of local populations (e.g. heads of village and communal development committees). In addition to the national committee, two regional technical committees will also be set up to monitor the implementation of activities in the field.

## **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**

JS - 3/25/2019

Cleared.

JS-10/18/2019

Please describe the projects' specific contribution to Togo's LDN targets and elaborate more precisely on the project's specific alignment with the national biodiversity strategy.

**Agency Response**

**20March2020**

The project will contribute substantially to the implementation of the UNCCD 2018-2030 Strategic Framework and its Strategic Objective 1: To improve the condition of affected ecosystems, combat desertification/land degradation, promote sustainable land management and contribute to land degradation neutrality. By 2030 Togo aims to restore at least 80% of degraded lands (187,920 ha) and limit to 2% (108,802 ha) the degradation of non-degraded land, with the aim of reinforcing terrestrial ecosystem preservation with reference to the baseline (2010). By restoring 22,000 ha, the project will contribute to achieving 11% of the national target for land restoration, and by facilitating sustainable land management in over 37,000 ha the project will contribute to an estimated 34% of the national target.

The project is in line with Togo's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (SPANB 2010-2020) which aims, by 2050, to achieve a new balance between economic, social and environmental development through the enhancement, conservation, restoration and sustainable use of the biological diversity of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems as well as their resilience to all forms of threats, including the negative effects of climate change for the benefit of present and future generations. The project will contribute to the target of reducing the rate of degradation and fragmentation of natural habitats to 2% and reducing the area burned by 2020. The project will furthermore contribute directly to Strategic Directions B, C, D and E of the NBSAP, relating to enhancing the benefits of biodiversity and ecosystem services for all, improving the legal, institutional and governance framework, developing knowledge of national biological resources and building technical and human capacity.

**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**

JS- 3/25/2019

Cleared.

JS-10/18/2019

As per comment 3 above on component 4, KM is mostly generic language that could be used for any project. Please elaborate on aspects of KM that are specific to the project.

**Agency Response**

**20March2020**

Section 8 on Knowledge Management is intentionally concise in order to avoid repetition, especially since the project includes a dedicated component on knowledge management, M&E processes, and gender equality mainstreaming. Component 4 was revised as per comments provided above (see response to comment 3), including reference to institutional uptake of tools and innovations. During the project preparation phase, this component will be further detailed in line with its specific target audiences, sites, and interventions.

**Part III – Country Endorsements**

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

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

JS 4/22/2020

Many thanks for the translation, cleared.

JS 4/21/2020

Please provide a courtesy English translation of the LOE, which was submitted in French only.

JS – 3/25/2020

The LOE is adequate. We note the use of \$1.45 million marginal adjustment in favor of LD programming out of the \$2 million total marginal adjustment allowed for Togo.

Cleared.

JS-10/17/2019

The LOE signed by the OFP is provided. However, the breakdown of funds among focal area does not correspond with that of the PIF. Please make sure they match in subsequent submissions.

## **Agency Response**

**22April2020**

The English translation of the LOE has been uploaded under the Roadmap documents.

**20March2020**

The breakdown of funds was adjusted in line with the revised LOE (see response to comment 1).

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

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

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

### **Agency Response**

#### **GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

**JS 4/22/2020**

**Yes, the PIF is recommended for technical clearance.**

JS 4/21/2020

Please provide a courtesy English translation of the LOE, which was submitted in French only.

JS 4/20/2020

Yes, the PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

JS 4/17/2019

Not at this stage. Please address comments above (highlighted in yellow, boxes I.6, II.1, II.6 and Risks) and resubmit.

JS - 3/25/2019

Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS-10/18/2019

The PIF is not recommended for technical clearance at this point. Please revise and resubmit.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

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

Please ensure that final project submission adheres to the GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards. By the time of CEO endorsement please ensure that UNDP's safeguard policies are applied in full, including FPIC, and provide the documentation as an annex

During PPG, please also:

- consolidate co-financing;

- develop criteria and mechanism of delivery for the small grants the project intends to distribute, ensuring that the objectives of the small grants are fully aligned with the mission of the GEF and the theory of change of the GEF project, and ensuring adequate transparency;

- explore linkages and collaboration with baseline projects indicated in the PIF, in particular with the Dryland Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program and its child project in Burkina Faso.



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

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

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

The objective of this LD-BD MFA project is to accelerate sustainable land management and restoration for achieving land degradation neutrality while benefitting agro-pastoral livelihoods and globally significant biodiversity in Savanes and Kara Regions of Togo.

The project targets northern Togo, in the transition zone between the Savanna and Sahelian bioclimatic zones, because of its global biodiversity relevance (part of an important transboundary corridor for the threatened West African elephant and other wildlife), its pronounced land degradation and high levels of rural poverty.

The project has four components. Under component 1, the project will strengthen the enabling environment and capacities for sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation. It will notably develop participatory management plans at the watershed, landscape and local levels, set up an open access GIS and remote sensing-based monitoring system, provide training and tools, and establish extension service units. Component 2 will implement sustainable land management, restoration of degraded land and forests, and biodiversity conservation at site level. Component 3 will promote sustainable nature-based livelihood opportunities, including through the establishment of cooperative units and local processing packaging units and the development of investment opportunities for impact funds. Finally, Component 4 gathers the project’s Knowledge management, M&E, and gender equality mainstreaming activities.

The project is set to improve management effectiveness of 371,000 ha of protected areas (PA), restore 22,000 ha of highly degraded forest land and bring an additional 37,000 ha under improved practices, including 5,000 ha of important wildlife corridors. These interventions will contribute to mitigate 6.8 million tCO<sub>2</sub>eq and benefit directly 128,000 people, including 76,800 women.

The project will leverage \$9,489,230 in co-financing (1:1.5 ratio), mostly new investment mobilized (1:1.1).

The project will contribute to maintaining GEF support to important protected areas despite their challenging context. It will indeed intervene in the same location as a GEF-4 project (ID 4026, SPWA-BD: Strengthening the Conservation Role of Togo's National System of Protected Areas), which attempted to redelineate PAs suffering from high encroachment but had to change part of its target landscapes in 2015 because of the opposition of some local communities to conservation-related interventions. The project will integrate the lessons learned of the GEF-4 project, in particular the need for: i) substantial emphasis on ensuring adherence to FPIC processes; ii) extensive outreach and awareness raising; iii) facilitating dialogue between community members, local and national government representatives to enable conflict prevention; and iv) active engagement of local communities in sustainable forest/land/PA management activities while demonstrating livelihood benefits, in addition to addressing risks related to increased potential of human wildlife conflicts.