

Integrated landscape management to reverse degradation and support the sustainable use of natural resources in the Mopane-Miombo belt of Northern Namibia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10251

Countries

Namibia

Project Name

Integrated landscape management to reverse degradation and support the sustainable use of natural resources in the Mopane-Miombo belt of Northern

Namibia

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/10/2020

Review completed by PM

4/7/2021

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

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

April 7, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

Note: The para 255 and 256 have not been removed .

January 15, 2021

- Alignment with GEF Focal Area and Impact Program Strategies: The para 255 and 256 are not needed. Only the alignment with the Dryland IP objectives is expected .
Please, correct.

- Portal : Please revise the Rio Markers. All GEF investments using CCM resources should be CCM2 and the IP incentive is partially financed by CCM set aside resources.

For the CCA Rio Marker, you selected CCA1, but the notions of resilience or adaptation are absent from the result framework. Without further information or explanation, we would suggest CCA0. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021

Para 255 and 256 have now been removed from the portal entry as well. Apologies for the oversight.

Noted and corrected accordingly

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

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

Project framework

Output 1.2.1: Several activities are not welcome in the result framework and should have been included in the PPG. It is at least surprising to propose at this stage a) the identification of good practices in the targeted landscapes, b) collection of data, c) conflict identification, d) site validation, e) support the inventory of plants and animals to establish a baseline? All the baseline for monitoring should be available at CEO endorsement (NB: this is the practice since GEF4).

Output 1.2.2: all activities to improve the effective use of LDN targets are welcome. However, it seems that the proposed activities are partially covered under UNCCD enabling activities, with a risk of duplication. More importantly, the proposed activities miss the main gap of the reasoning: financing sustainability of LDN implementation (and not the financial aspects of designing and monitoring LDN targets)

Output 1.2.3: Please, note that all the activities of integrated land-use planning for the Kavango site are already financed under the GEF6/UNDP project (GEFID 9426, NILALEG). Modify the paras 173-175, and the related budget.

Outcome 2.2: the definition of SLM, SFM, landscape restoration should be clarified, and the technical itineraries should be available (cf. indicator 10).

Output 2.2.1: We welcome the focus on Forest and Farm Producer Organizations. However, beyond access to seedbank and training, we do not clearly see how these Organizations will be financially supported on the long term. The sustainability aspects on the ground ? PES, incentives, taxes, financing mechanisms, fund, etc. -are absent. This comment is also connected to modifications expected in the component 1.

Output 2.2.2: We welcome the Value Chain Analysis and the possibility to green some of them (Table 6). However, the text is silent on the meaning of ?greening? and the kind of support that will be proposed. To be developed.

Output 3.1.1: several activities related to LDN assessment, monitoring, reporting systems, and tools, platforms seem redundant with previous activities proposed under the component 1 (outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.2), as well as upcoming enabling activities under UNCCD. Please, revise.

Same comment about the output 3.1.2 ?capacity development program to support national LDN reporting?. Check eventual duplications.

We suggest including elements of financing sustainability to strengthen the LDN framework (both from domestic and external resources).

Lastly, we suggest reducing the budget for consultations, planning, studies, and KM and assigning more budget for field interventions at scale.

Agency Response

Noted. The project?s results framework and corresponding activities have been refined accordingly.

Output 1.2.1 has been removed. The project will build upon the PPG baseline assessment results (see further down, list of PPG assessments) and the integrated landscape assessment activities for ILUP development under Output 1.2.1.

Output 1.2.2 has been refined, UNCCD enabling activities were removed or adjusted accordingly. Financing opportunities for SLM/SFM implementation have been included under Outcome 1.1 (Output 1.1) and under Outcome 2.2 (Output 2.2.1). The project?s ToC has been updated accordingly. More detailed changes are summarized further down.

Consultation with government focal points and the National Coordinator of the NILALEG project revealed that the GEF-6 UNDP project does not cover the proposed intervention site for the DSL IP project (in terms of integrated land-use planning and implementation of SLM and SFM activities). Moreover, the Government of Namibia is keen to maintain the proposed DSL IP site in Kavango East, thereby complementing the

NILALEG target site in Kavango West, some 150 km apart as evident from the new map in ProDoc Section 6b (para 333). Nor is there any geographic overlap with any of the other NILALEG target sites. See corresponding map: [gef_nilaleg.png - Google Drive](#)

Outcome 2.2. and corresponding output 2.2.1 have been refined. The project now provides a detailed overview of the proposed SLM/SFM interventions within the targeted LUS in the three sub-basins, as well as the respective alignment with targeted value chains (summarized in new Table 6).

The project's results framework and corresponding activities (including ToC) have been refined to strengthen the financing aspects that are closely interlinked with supporting forest and farm producer organizations' value chains.

Significant changes include:

- ? Strengthening the logframe in Table B with reference to including 'sustainable financing mechanisms' in Outcome 1.1/Output 1.1.2 (including in the titles); and likewise in Outcome 2.2 (reference to sustainable enterprises in the title) and Output 2.2.1 (reference to technical and financial instruments in title) where significant changes have been made to the text.
- ? Further elaboration on barriers 3-4 in the sub-section on Accessing Finance of SLM and SFM.
- ? Thus, Output 1.1.2 includes new activities on investment maps, plans and knowledge products that will support forest and farm producers and value chain capacities as advocates for SFM.
- ? Thus, major changes have been made to Outcome 2.2/Output 2.2.1 by way of clarifying the links between producers and value chains; giving more emphasis to the opportunities for women, youth to engage in enterprises; and generating a set of production interventions that align with respective value chain initiatives. Also, these activities are aligned clearly with the respective landscapes and target indicators. Essentially, indicative activities for Outcome 2.2, which used to comprise 2 Outputs, have been revamped under a new single Output 2.2.1 that reflects the value chain from production to consumption, with emphasis of adding as much value (processing) as practicable at the community/rural/MSME's end of the spectrum.

Table 6 provides a more detailed overview on how SLM/SFM interventions are directly linked to the targeted value chains. The term green is therefore directly linked to sustainable management of the landscape - showing no net degradation according to LDN criteria.

Reference is also made in the project document to note that: "CSB and FFS activities to be complemented by value chain activities, given to the extent that raw materials (plants and animals) are sourced from landscapes where degradation is stable or reducing by project end."

Output 3.1.1 and Output 3.1.2 have been removed. Eligible activities (related to integrated landscape assessment and planning) were shifted and integrated under Output 1.2.1 and 1.2.2.

Financing opportunities for SLM/SFM implementation have been included under Outcome 1.1 (Output 1.1) and under Outcome 2.2 (Output 2.2.1).

The budget has been revised accordingly. Investments for field interventions have been increased.

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

April 7, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

- Following GEF policies, the cofinancing needs to be documented at CEO endorsement. For the projects ending in 2022, please confirm that it is correct to consider the whole amount as cofinancing: it seems that a prorata should be applied as most of the financing was already spent in previous years.

- It is up to you to manage the uncertainties, but the notion of future cofinancing does not exist. You need to document cofinancing at CEO endorsement. Please, confirm. You will have the opportunity to report in the PIRs any evolution of this cofinancing.

- Under the table C, you explained that FAO and the government worked together to identify the sources of cofinancing, but you did not define "investments mobilized" (by defining, we mean explaining the difference with the recurrent expenditures from the government, partners, and FAO). Please, complete.

- Cofinancing from FAO: In the letter from FAO, we can read that \$100,000 is considered in grants and \$50,000 in-kind. The change has not been reflected in the portal. Please, address.

January 15, 2021

Cofinancing

- From a general point view, mixing baseline financing and cofinancing at the same level, while allowed in GEF policies, gives a wrong impression. The cofinancing (\$180 million) is very high, and several aspects seem very far from LDN, land restoration, and LDN. We invite the GEF Agency to be more selective about cofinancing among the projects and initiatives that are effectively going to catalyze GEB in this project. Please, revise.

- The previous comment notably targets the cofinancing of 103 million of US\$ from the Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Land reform. We would like the insurance that 100% of the mentioned projects are taking the same direction than the Drylands IP project. We would need further description of the projects related to 1) horticulture, 2) water, 3) agricultural mechanization and seed improvement, and 4) agro-processing facilities. Said differently, we invite the GEF Agency to be more selective and reduce the cofinancing to a coherent set of projects and investments directly connected to the project. Please, revise.

- In which way the "Cosmetic Sector Industry Growth Programme" can be considered as cofinancing? How this project contributes to generate global environment benefits related to SLM and SFM? Please, clarify.

- Based on the definition proposed for investments mobilized applicable to the different projects, in-kind cofinancing from FAO (\$50,000) cannot be qualified as investments mobilized, and it would create a wrong precedent. This contribution in-kind enters the definition of recurrent expenditures. Please, correct.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021

The amount of co-financing for projects ending in 2022 were already adjusted and a new letter of co-financing obtained and uploaded (co-financing amount from EIF has been reduced from the original USD 16 million to USD 9,6 million).

Noted and confirmed. FAO and the government are confident that additional co-financing from MAWLR can be identified and included during the project's implementation (in line with the GEF co-financing guidelines).

The co-financing definition has been amended where necessary. Information on investment mobilized included.

FAO's co-financing is now correctly reflected in the portal

MAWLR has reviewed its cofinancing and the co-financing has been aligned more closely to project's scope resulting in an overall reduction in total cofinancing from 103 M to USD 18 M. However, there remain some significant unknowns, including: (i) status of projects due to end in 2022 but may be extended (e.g. the Ministry has started to work on the planning of activities for 2021/2022 this month); (ii) insufficient time to examine the potential alignment of certain potential cofinancing budgets.

Therefore, it is proposed that the cofinancing amount for MAWLR will be finalised during project inception to allow more accurate determined of this budget line.

The Cosmetic Sector Industry Growth Programme (CSIGP) has been removed as co-financing source for now. Potential contributions from this programme will however be reviewed during the project's implementation. Herbal medicine value chains and nature-based cosmetics are of particular interest for the DSL IP Namibia Child Project, to the extent that sustainable value chains based on product that sustainable use indigenous plants from miombo and mopane woodlands as raw materials can help safeguard the flow of ecosystem services within the landscapes. Some of the promising drylands value chains in the DSL IP Namibia Child Project, in particular regarding natural oils (Marula and Manketti) can potentially be supported by (CSIGP) from a trade and industrialization points of view.

FAO's co-financing has been changed to in-kind.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

PPG

- Please, provide a list of studies and assessments financed under the PPG.
- Please, explain the work undertaken at PPG to review, assess, and empower the national entities in charge of project execution.

Agency Response

The selected approach for the PPG baseline assessment and subsequent project development was closely linked to STAP's guidance on applying RAPTA and the LDN Conceptual Framework (Module A). The approach was jointly developed with the six Southern Africa DSL IP countries and applied in harmonized manner during the PPG period.

A regional training and planning session were held in Johannesburg, South Africa from 19-29 August 2019 to provide simultaneous training on an integrated baseline assessment approach to PPG teams, FAO country focal points, as well as government focal points from the six DSL IP countries (list of participants in Annex 2). As a result of the training session, the participants were enabled and empowered to lead the various baseline assessments.

Tools and methodologies were selected based on the ability to carry out multi-variable assessments at various scales within the given (PPG) timeframe and in close alignment with RAPTA and the LDN conceptual framework/CF (Module A). The assessment results were used for project targeting (child projects) and will form the foundation for the subsequent development of integrated Land Use Plans (informed decision making).

The baseline assessments conducted in Namibia took place at different levels (national and landscape level) and timelines using various participatory and inclusive tools and data collection formats as follows:

1. Remote sensing of Phase 1 sites using Collect Earth to determine types of land use, land use change, land cover, and disturbances for project site selection (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1hY0U0MDInskD9JJBhyTokSR9x1sUyb2h/view?usp=sharing>)
2. Multi-stakeholder group (MSG) discussions (1-2 days) at the targeted sub-basins comprising of:

a. Rapid participatory land degradation (LD) assessment to determine the main types, extent, degree, rate and causes of land degradation; main groups of SLM/SFM practices implemented

https://drive.google.com/file/d/16t7IysOQG_n1XKg0Nh_Rmi5TxqJUzqCv/view?usp=sharing

b. Participatory stakeholder analysis (note: same exercise was conducted for the national level during PPG inception workshop)

3. Policy, institutional and capacity needs analysis

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1apM7G7BWLPFK9DtpOybntHO6jjXhyTa/view?usp=sharing>

4. Rapid sustainable value chain mapping, prioritization and analysis:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JtE8-](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JtE8-8Oy_26txomgA6R6H2IRbdHrL9OQ/view?usp=sharing)

[8Oy_26txomgA6R6H2IRbdHrL9OQ/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1JtE8-8Oy_26txomgA6R6H2IRbdHrL9OQ/view?usp=sharing)

& <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZvCTAUt34BZGUVQR8Rh5MmBbSvUjaO77/view?usp=sharing>

5. Indigenous Peoples and the Free, Prior and Informed Consent assessment (FPIC) assessments:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nh3LMIHndSL1yQZIm1NdHaoFvps1WtkP/view?usp=sharing>

6. LDN checklist (as request by STAP):

https://drive.google.com/file/d/13usIS7IJ_YJ4P83I3MfwFgtKEKxiv6I2/view?usp=sharing

7. Household surveys using the Self-evaluation and Holistic Assessment of climate Resilience for farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP) tool to assess resilience of rural households:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1wbzm02A1eIw7RMeScrN9G_N2r_WQxuPi/view?usp=sharing (report presents the analysis of 316 households in Kavango, Omusati and Oshikoto)

The PPG team comprised national consultants (Dr Simeon Hengari - Capacity, Institutions and Policy consultant, Dr Simon Angombe - Value Chain Consultant, Ms Errika Mokanya ? Enumerator, Mr Brian Madumbi ? Enumerator, Mr Benyamin Nathanael ? Enumerator)

as well as government focal points who participated in the PPG trainings and assessment work (Mr Amon Andreas - Chief Conservation Scientist, Directorate of Environmental Affairs - Ministry Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT), Mr Fillemon Kayofa - Deputy Director-Forestry - Ministry Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT), Mr Theodor Kaambu - Senior Forester - Ministry Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT).

the PPG assessment results were used to establish the current status (baseline) and to identify gaps/barriers to be addressed by the project. The capacity of the lead executing entities will be enhanced and the executing partners will be empowered to apply a comprehensive integrated landscape assessment approach (following the ILAM which is closely aligned with the UNCCD LDN CF) to make more informed decisions on targeted SLM/SFM interventions at the landscapes. The executing entities will further be capacitated to implement new and innovative approaches (e.g. FFS, FFF, CSB) that can be up and outscaled beyond the targeted landscapes. The sharing of lessons learned between all the Miombo/Mopane countries (facilitated by REM) will enable government entities to address common management challenges in a more harmonized manner, benefitting from community of practices.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

When the project framework will have been revised (less planning, less consultations, and more field interventions) and the selected landscapes confirmed (without Kavango), please adjust the targets under the different indicators.

Agency Response

The project results framework has been refined accordingly. It should be noted that integrated landscape planning and management does depend on available data (and related integrated landscape assessment work) for the government to make informed decisions that are well aligned the LDN CF, as well as cross-sectoral and participatory consultation at landscape level.

The interest of government to include the target landscape in Kavango East is provided above (Section 2). A key priority during inception will be to host a small workshop with NILALEG project to identify some immediate synergies and sharing of tasks/resources (e.g. on training and workshops) that will reduce costs and/or replicate benefits across more stakeholders/larger areas; and longer-term initiatives to sustain the momentum gained by GEF-6 project. Part of that collaboration could be support from NILALEG

towards Kavango, especially since Kavango was originally one of the shortlisted sites for NILALEG and government was disappointed it got dropped.

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

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

The problems are well identified, but the proposed project seems too focused on capacities and planning, and not enough on the change of technical itineraries on the ground related to subsistence agriculture and rangeland management. Please, adjust the reasoning and the proposed response.

Agency Response Done. See responses above.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

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

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

We suggest reducing the technical assistance and consultations, as well as possible duplications of activities related to planning and KM, and re-orient the resources to field activities for more climate smart agriculture and agroecological intensification practices.

Agency Response Done. See responses above.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 7, 2021

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

Addressed (see item 1, part I, though, about the sections 255 and 256 in the portal).

January 15, 2021

Yes.

- Alignment with GEF Focal Area and Impact Program Strategies: The para 255 and 256 are not needed. Only the alignment with the Dryland IP objectives is expected . Please, correct.

Agency Response

April 06, 2021

Both sections were also deleted in the portal.

Noted and changed accordingly.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 5, 2021

See item on cofinancing: Confirmation of cofinancing is due at CEO endorsement.

January 15, 2021

See previous comments on cofinancing and the focus of the project. Adjustments are needed.

Agency Response

April 14, 2021

Noted, see earlier response on co-financing

The co-financing has been adjusted but that for one partner awaits further, more detailed examination and includes unknowns about 3rd party initiatives that will become clearer later this year. See earlier response.

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

April 5, 2021

Addressed

January 15, 2021

Yes. However we suggest investing more resources on field activities to better justify the areas under SLM, SFM, and landscape restoration.

Agency Response Noted. See earlier response.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes

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

Yes.

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

Yes. cf. Annex I2.

Agency Response

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

The role of women is fundamental to the achievement of the project's objective.

The Gender Action Plan includes the importance of addressing gender inequalities.

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

April 5, 2021

Addressed

January 15, 2021

- The drivers of land degradation are related to subsistence farming systems and unsustainable rangeland management. Are there any solutions involving the private sector? The annex on value chains describe value chain approaches for poultry, Marula, Ximenia, and fodder. We are not seeing the direct connection between the problems and applicable solutions at scale. Please, clarify.

- The opportunities for sustainable charcoal could be further developed. Strong participation from both smallholder and large-scale farmers in Namibia has been supported through GIZ and resulted in market linkage to German companies such as Lidl and certification under the FSC. Importantly, such certification includes the assessment of sustainable land use and the maintenance of complementary economic activities under FSC approaches, of which only a few exist globally, notably in Namibia.

- During the design of this project, we understand there were discussions about the charcoal value chain and potential interesting partners from the private sector (CMO?). Could you explain what happened and if there is a chance for a partnership?

Agency Response

Refer to above response to Output 2.2.1 regarding the major changes that have been made to Outcome 2.2/Output 2.2.1 that clarifies and elaborates on these connections between problems and connections.

Activities on sustainable charcoal production linked to bush encroachment are included under Output 2.2.1A. Certification schemes, in particular FSC for sustainably produced charcoal and collaboration with regional private sector companies (e.g. CMO), will be followed up during the project's implementation if needed with REM support.

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

April 5, 2021

Addressed

January 15, 2021

- We take note of the risks and counter-measures identified at operational level vis-?-vis the COVID-19 situation. However, please elaborate further the eventual opportunities presented by the current situation. See potential synergy and collaboration with other initiatives (health, food, social, environment, ?).
- Please confirm that there will be no displacement of local communities or indigenous people supported by the project.
- Please, assess any reputational risks from projects and initiatives included in the cofinancing.
- We welcome the use of tools as SHARP and other IFAD/ACDI climate analysis to incorporate climate risks in land-use planning approaches.

Agency Response

The COVID-19 section now incorporates National responses. The new text covering the current situation in-country, governments responses and national socio-economic impacts and forecasts to date can be found under Sub-section (5) Risks. It includes the project's strong alignment with the government's COVID Recovery Plan.

The project will not support any replacement of local communities or indigenous people. Please also see response from the government of Namibia below. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/11UDKctZTgo7i9Fx4KrQAnf-KneLNgiv/view?usp=sharing>

The project interventions have been reviewed, including initiatives from co-financing. No reputational risks have been identified. For the Environmental and Social Risks identified during the PPG, the project will implement a risk mitigation plan as outlined in the project document ANNEX II.

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

April 5, 2021

OK. See the comments on the budget below.

January 15, 2021

Implementation arrangements

Clarifications are needed to better understand the implementation arrangements:

- FAO will provide specialists on land tenure, mapping and data management, FFFs (including FFSs experts), and a CBSs specialist?? If the point is to use GEF resources from the project grant to finance FAO experts, it is not a system we recommend. Please, clarify.
- In the budget, we note that \$720,000 are planned to be managed by FAO for consultants (\$414,250), travels (\$100,000), and evaluation and audits (\$206,550). We take note of the justification provided in the annex on the "tailored technical assistance". We do not subscribe to this way of doing and prefer to see a full NIM mode in place (Flexibility is possible for the M&E requirements and the audits though, without asking for an exception). Please, modify.
- ?FAO responsibilities, as GEF agency, will include: Administrate funds from GEF in accordance with the rules and procedures of FAO?. Actually, in a National Implementation Mode arrangement, we would expect the main Executing entity (the Ministry) to administrate funds, not FAO. Please, clarify.

Coordination

We would need more than an intention of synergy with other projects, especially the GEFID 9426: this \$10 million SFM investment designed by UNDP is focused on one of the selected landscapes (Kavango-East, and the forested North-Eastern stripe) with similar approaches of SLM, forest restoration in application of LDN targets than the proposed GEF7 Dryland IP child project.

- Without further explanation, there are high risks of duplication. Please, detail the mechanisms of collaboration, and confirm that all is done by FAO (and UNDP) to avoid this risk of duplication.
- This risk of duplication may also need an adjustment of the proposed targets under the different core indicators, as well as an adjustment of selected landscapes: the GEFID 9426 project already claimed areas under SLM, SFM, and restoration in the Kavango landscape (10,000 ha of restored woodlands and savannah habitats, 3,000 ha for forests

under community management, 15,000 ha of agricultural lands under SLM, 10,000 ha of forests under protection with the establishment of a Regional Forest Reserve + 1.3 million tons of CO₂e + 20,000 beneficiaries). Please, verify and adjust.

- We do not see the interest to include the Kavango landscape in this GEF7 project with high risks of duplication and double-counting with the GEF6 UNDP project already investing \$10 million in this landscape. We suggest focusing this GEF7 investment of \$6.13 million to the Kunene-Cuvelai and the Etosha landscape, also reducing the risk of dispersal.

Agency Response

April 23, 2021 (responding to April 13 comments, CEO endorsement section).

Table B has been corrected (M&E column removed)

(i) Technical consultants listed in the budget will not carry out any project management related functions. The PMU mapping in the budget has been corrected accordingly. All PMU profiles are now covered under PMC (note: the National Technical Coordinator will partially be covered under the project's PMC and the project's components as this profile will also be tasked with technical deliverables as outlined in the corresponding TORs. The government will provide substantial PMC related support which includes the provision of additional vehicles, running costs, drivers, as indicated in the previous response, besides providing office space, maintenance, staff time and office supplies. The direct co-financing of PMU staff with available co-financing will not be possible due to the nature of co-financing.

(ii) The Executing Capacity Development and ESS monitoring specialist is now charged on M&E budget line.

(iii) The detailed budget is now provided in the annex.

Clarification: the proposed inclusion of technical assistance was based on a capacity building approach according to identified capacity gaps at various levels. FAO has not intended to engage/finance FAO experts but international consultants in the sub-region that are familiar with the corresponding technical approaches working directly with PMU and government counter parts as part of a capacity building approach at the onset of the projects.

However, based on GEFSec's response and recommendation, all international technical consultants were removed, and resources shifted towards field implementation.

FAO is now only providing minor, very targeted support functions to the lead executing agency (The Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism, MEFT) and the co-

executing agency (The Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform, MAWLR) at country level that are directly linked to the EAs? Risk Mitigation Monitoring capacity (identified fiduciary and environmental and social risks) as well as the coherent delivery of the project.

For this purpose and as requested by the government, FAO will engage a national expert (Execution Capacity Development Support and ESS monitoring specialist) budgeted for from the PMC and M&E budget and co-funded by the agency fee to build the EAs? capacity in the following:

- ? Support in managing risks related to environmental and social safeguards (ESS) that were triggered, and the implementation and monitoring of corresponding risk mitigation plan. The ESS that require additional support are related to conflict resolution and tenure (as part of the integrated land use planning), crop genetic resources (related to the establishment of seeds banks) and the inclusion of indigenous people. See relevant section in the ProDoc.
- ? Support the implementing the fiduciary risk mitigation plan. While MAWLR guarantees most (but not all) the set of expertise, convening power and compliance with UN and GEF fiduciary standards required to execute, MEFT needs PMC and Risk Mitigation Monitoring support of its execution capacities. The fiduciary assessment of execution capacity (conducted by the external audit firm?BDO)?has identified a number of weaknesses that will need active support and capacity building to enable MEFT to perform their role as Executing Agency. This will be required especially during the first 2 years of implementation. As part of this process, the EA has requested training for harmonizing their procurement standards and process with UN and GEF standards, specifically on OPIM requirements. The fiduciary assessment also highlighted significant risks posed by MEFT?s limited sub-contracting capacities. The assessment is available if needed.
- ? Coordinating the project?s complex institutional arrangements (2 main executing partners, MEFT and MAWLR and several sub-partners including national NGOs, the University of Namibia, regional entities and others) which require a high level of coordination, M&E and learning efforts. The FAO expert will ensure that all AWP&B, procurement plans and reporting products are prepared in a consistent manner for a smooth review and approval from the Project Steering Committee, a key PMC support task that Executing Agencies, alone, will not be able to ensure for a program of this complexity.
- ? Ensuring coherence and timely engagement with regional and global learning, monitoring, and reporting efforts as well as the provision of the GCP?s technical support services. FAO is well-positioned to ensure that the project optimizes its interactions both regionally and globally. Through this targeted support the project management unit will be in a better position to interface directly with the Regional Exchange Mechanism, ensuring a consistent and reliable bi-directional flow of data and knowledge.

In view of the tasks, the inputs provided by the implementing agency fee and own co-financing alone are not expected to be sufficient to ensure the desired level of coordination, application of environmental and social safeguards, coherent flow of knowledge and monitoring of agencies performances and contributions.

TORS: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1eDsEAjHtXK1enKDETxOOvcVDEZpoysI-/view?usp=sharing>

See earlier response on the different geographic coverage of the two projects. In addition, the following structures are in place to ensure a close coordination and complementary between the DSL IP and the GEF-6 NILALEG project.

Both project coordination units are hosted by MEFT, hence the project coordinators will work closely together to ensure complementarity of targeted interventions. The DSL IP project will be further integrated into the government's joint advisory forum. The JAF currently oversees the implementation of NILALEG and GCF EDA project and comprises the Ministry of Environment Forestry and Tourism (MEFT), the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Land Reform (MAWLR), the Environmental Investment Fund (EIF) as well as representatives from other sectors.

Regarding the selection of the GEF-7 sites, a multi criteria analysis was done to identify the most suitable areas based on programme guidance, with the main parameters including:

- Areas within the drylands domain;
- Ongoing degradation processes;
- Multi land use landscapes; -

Potential to contribute to LDN by avoiding, reducing and reversing LD;

In comparison to the other landscapes selected in Namibia (Kunene-Cuvelai and Etosha), this area is characterized by frequent incidence of fires, a forest structure featuring denser canopy cover, and higher species diversity. This unique combination requires tailored design of SFM/SLM interventions that take these characteristics into consideration.

The site is considerably distant from the NILALEG project sites and, indeed, is conveniently located midway between two of the sites that are approximately 650 km apart. The cumulative potential impact of the two GEF-funded projects in one of high presence (profile) and demonstration of SLM/SFM across northern Namibia.

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
Addressed.

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

April 5, 2021

It is our understanding that the technical costs of REM will be covered by the GCP.
Only travel budgets are assigned to the child project budget.

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

- Regional Exchange Mechanism: We take note of the need and the idea to promote Regional Exchanges under the DSL IP. However, supporting three platforms/facilities under the GCP seems a lot for the DSL IP and difficult to justify for a fixed-term initiative as the DSL IP. We suggest looking at the comparative advantage of different options at global, continent and sub-regional levels, and select a more acceptable solution (WOCAT, GGWI, UA/NEPAD/TerrAfrica, IGAD, SADEC, UNCCD Knowledge Hub...).

Agency Response

April 6, 2021

Confirmed.

The concept of the Regional Exchange Mechanism (REM) was discussed during the DSL IP stakeholder meeting in Rome (January 2020) where 200 stakeholders from governments, GEF agencies, global NGOs, GEF Secretariat and the UNCCD Secretariat came together to exchange on progress and lessons from implementation of the respective PPGs in the 11 DSL IP countries as well as the proposed structure of the GCP. During the workshop stakeholders gave preference for and expressed the need of an exchange mechanism at the regional level.

As such the REM will not duplicate but rather leverage on existing platforms (e.g. SADC GGWI, Miombo network in the case of the Miombo/Mopane countries) and support a well-coordinated effort in identifying and addressing common management challenges in a coherent and harmonized way. As outlined in the Miombo/Mopane REM strategy, success in addressing these management challenges in will depend to a significant degree on the timely deployment of specialized technical support, implementation of evidence-based good practices, knowledge sharing, and support for communities of practice (both nationally and regionally). Conditions to enable this to happen are currently weak at national level due to the following barriers: 1) limited collaboration and cooperation among countries leading to duplication and missed opportunities for synergies; 2) limited access to technical, methodological, financial and other capacity development support available in the region; 3) limited capacities/mechanisms for knowledge management at regional level; 4) limited mechanisms for scaling out good practices; and 5) limited mechanisms and capacities for monitoring and evaluation with regional perspective. Participating countries will benefit greatly from outside, independent support to facilitate resolution of shared barriers. The identification of regional market and Miombo/Mopane product labeling opportunities, relevant regional private sector entities (e.g. COMO) are additional benefits.

The costs of the West Africa, East Africa and Central Asia outreach have been reviewed in discussion with the co-executing partner IUCN, taking into account that; (a) on the one hand, the scale of effort in any given outreach is not necessarily proportional to the number of IP-participating countries that it includes (in the regions with fewer countries, addressing transboundary issues and regional-level scaling, both of which are at the heart of IP logic and requires a greater level of investment ? beyond the budgetary scope of the IP child projects ? in outreach and engagement of neighbouring non-IP countries in the region); and (b) on the other hand, costs have been minimized as far as possible by taking advantage of the existing structures to which IUCN has access and leverage with respect to these regions.

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
Addressed.

Agency Response
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
April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

We understand the general reasoning of the project, but further details on the technical aspects related to SLM, SFM, and value chain greening would help to better figure out the buy-in by local communities and smallholder farmers, the direct benefits for these groups, and the potential for sustainability. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

See earlier comment on clear description of SLM and SFM related interventions and corresponding value chains as well as the benefits thereof.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
April 7, 2021

We take note that cofinancing from the government will include three vehicles and drivers to support project activities. FAO will also provide logistical support for regular supervision missions, including a 4x4 vehicle and driver. We found these explanations

acceptable and agree on the purchase of two 4x4 vehicles + operating costs + one driver.

Addressed.

April 5, 2021

- We take note of the budget for an Execution Capacity Development Expert and ESS monitoring Specialist.
- A travel budget of \$160,000 is also planned for the attendance to GCP and REM meetings; \$150,000 for travels for stakeholder engagement, and \$200,000 for travels for PMU members - total of \$510,000 of travel budgets.
- We take note of the budget for two 4x4 vehicles (\$80,000), operating costs (\$100,000) and one driver (\$84,000). It is mentioned that "other vehicles" will be covered by cofinancing, as well as a second driver: Is it possible to be more accurate on the number of vehicles provided by cofinancing?
- Under these conditions, is a budget of \$200,000 for travels of PMU members needed (\$40,000 per year)? Who will be covered by the travel budget of \$160,000 to attend GCP and REM meetings?

January 15, 2021

Budget

- Please, check the numbers between the portal and the project document (GEF Grant: \$6,130,275; cofinancing: \$172,550,000; and not US \$ 172,300,000)
- The budget includes \$2.137 million for international and national consultants and \$2.247 million of contracts. On one hand, we are not clearly seeing the percentage or amount of money that will be spent on the ground for concrete SLM, SFM and restoration activities ? this information would be useful. On other hand, the level of consultants seems high and raises a question about the value for money and the sustainability of the approach. To be clarified. It seems that the level of studies, assessments, and plans may be reduced to privilege actions on the ground and include some sustainability aspects.
- We are not seeing if ?contracts? or ?consultants? will serve both to design financing mechanisms on the ground and ensure some levels of sustainability. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

April 6, 2021

Based on a follow up consultation between FAO HQ, country office and MEFT (06 April), the government (Department of Environmental Affairs and Forestry) will cover (in-kind) co-financing for three vehicles and drivers to support project activities on the ground as well as in Windhoek. In addition, FAO will provide logistical support for regular supervision missions to the field (one 4x4 vehicle and driver).

The budget lines; travel for stakeholder engagement and travel for PMU members were reduced based on further consultation with the government and anticipated logistical support (to USD 120,000 and USD 100,000 respectively). The travel budget for national stakeholders' participation in regional and global events was slightly reduced to USD 150,000. The latter will cover international travel for government focal points (e.g. for policy/decision taking events) and selected government technical personnel as well as PMU members (e.g. for technical training events, following the ToT approach) according to the GCP/REM training and workshop objectives. The balance was re-distributed for field interventions under Component 2.

Co-financing figures have been reduced and are aligned between project document and the portal entry.

The budget for international consultants were removed as well as activities and budget lines for non-essential studies. In turn, investments for SLM/SFM interventions, corresponding value chain and financial support options were increased. See also earlier response.

The budget has been revised, international consultant budget line removed and resources allocated to Component 2. With regards to contracts, the lead executing MEFT, will use the contract budget line to involve relevant stakeholders in the project's implementation, including MAWLR (to implement crop, FFS and rural advisory services), the University of Namibia (being involved to support policy reform and the application of ILAM and ILUPs development, in close consultation with NILALEG monitoring efforts), local/national NGOs will play a major role as neutral entities to service the integrated/cross-sectoral landscape interventions etc. At the very local level, stakeholders targeted will be community and land users (farmers, foresters, livestock owners alongside Outrache officers from the relevant government agencies and the planners). Thus the breadth and depth of the engagement process for stakeholders will contribute significantly to Outcomes and their commitment towards ensuring the experience is replicated across Northern Namibia in the medium term.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 5, 2021

Addressed.

January 15, 2021

See above.

Agency Response

Note that comments and advice from STAP was followed and Council member comments addressed (see Additional Annex X-13, or link below)

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1RT-GCAeAnsMtqMfMK4EhBFGEjzaj3Rvc/view?usp=sharing>

Moreover, the government of Namibia provided an official response to Council member comments.

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/11UDKctZTgo7iI9Fx4KrQAnf-KneLNgiv/view?usp=sharing>

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

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 Addressed.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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
April 28, 2021

All points are addressed (see item on coordination and the revised budget).

April 13, 2021

Please, address the following issues raised at Control quality:

1. On Project description (Table B): note that an M&E line has been included in the project components that does not reflect the amount stipulated in the M&E budget. It also seems to be missing any kind of expected outcomes and outputs. Please request the agency to include and/or amend.

Table 23. Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Activities and Budget

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Estimate of costs (USD)
Inception Workshop (IW)	PMU, supported by LTO, BH, and GEF Coordination Unit (GCU)	Within two months of project start up	\$ 10,000
Project Inception Report	PMU, cleared by FAO LTO, HQ Officials, BH, and the GCU	Immediately after Inception Workshop	No extra cost
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPIs and PIRs	PMU, FAO (FAO Namibia, LTO), FAO-GCU may participate in the visits if needed	Annual or as required	LTO and GCU visits paid by GEF agency fee. NPC and CTA visits paid from project travel budget.
Project Progress Reports	BH with support from PMU, with key stakeholder inputs	Semi-annual, or as required	M&E Training Workshop \$ 24,350 M&E Expert \$ 43,200 M&E tools/equipment \$ 10,000
Project Implementation Review report	BH (in collaboration with PMU and LTO), Drafted by NPC, with supervision of LTO and BH. Approved and submitted to GEF by FAO-GCU	Annual	Paid by GEF agency fee
Co-financing Reports	BH with support from PMU and NPC and input from other co-financiers	Annual	Completed by NPC and CTA
Technical reports	PMU, BH, LTO and participating Units	As appropriate	No extra cost
Mid-term Review (MTR)	MTR: FAO Namibia, External consultant, in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000
Final evaluation (including Terminal Report)	Under the responsibility of FAO Office of Evaluation in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At end of project implementation	USD 48,550
Total Budget			USD 164,100

			exchange knowledge, experiences and lessons learnt at regional and global levels identified, developed and supported.		
M&E	Technical Assistance	n/a	n/a	GET	254,000.00
				Sub Total (\$)	5,838,357.00
				Project Management Cost (PMC)	
				GET	291,918.00
				Sub Total(\$)	3,390,000.00
				Total Project Cost(\$)	6,130,275.00
					54,549,374.00

- (i) Project staff (National Technical Coordinator; Administrative Assistant; Procurement and Operations) are either partially or totally charged to the project components ? the staff mapped top the Project Management Unit (PMU) must be charged firstly to the Project Management Costs of both ?the GEF portion and the co-

financing portion? (see Guidelines paragraph 5 ? page 49) ? please ask the Agency to amend. Same applies to several other positions mapped to the PMU: Integrated Landscape Planning and Implementation Expert (PMU); 1 driver.

(ii) Executing Capacity Development and ESS monitoring Specialist must be charged to the M&E Plan instead of to PMC.

(iii) Budget version in Portal is too general ? please include one that provides more details

April 7, 2021

The project is recommended for technical clearance.

April 5, 2021

Please, see the remaining comments on cofinancing and the budget.

January 15, 2021

Not yet. The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/5/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations