

Scaling up Cocoa-based Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration / Transformative Innovations in Cote d'Ivoire (SCOLUR-CI)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10247

Countries

Cote d'Ivoire

Project Name

Scaling up Cocoa-based Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration /
Transformative Innovations in Cote d'Ivoire (SCOLUR-CI)

Agencies

FAO, UNDP, UNIDO

Date received by PM

12/9/2020

Review completed by PM

5/5/2021

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

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

March 8, 2021:

No, Table A should only include one FOLUR IP outcome, not multiple outcomes based on Focal Areas (which should appear in Table D). The Agency should edit the Table A Focal Area Outcomes field to read as follows: ?Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.? Please revise accordingly.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23 - Table A has been revised 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

March 8, 2021:

1. The project duration is 48 months in the Portal and in the budget, while the time between the Expected Implementation Start and the Expected Completion Date is five years. Please correct and make the project duration consistent through all the documents provided.
2. On Proportionally of PMC: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC vis-a-vis the GEF contribution. If the GEF contribution is kept at 6.3%, for a co-financing of \$66,231,987 the expected contribution to PMC should normally be around \$3,896,052 instead of \$284,000 (which is 0.4%, much lower than 6.3%). Unless project specificities can be recognized, should the total PMC amount be at \$598,980 (\$314,980 + \$284,000), then the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution should be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach the same level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.
3. As presented in table B, the KM approach appears to be exclusively focus on the work with the FOLUR Global Platform. Please clarify the output(s) allowing/showing the knowledge management and sharing at national and sub-national levels too.
4. Component 4 has no indicator in table B. Please complete.

April 30, 2021:

1. No, the the time between the Expected Implementation Start and the Expected Completion Date still appears to be five years. Please correct.
- 2, 3 and 4. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

1. Addressed. Project duration is four years. This has been made consistent throughout.

2. Thank you for this comment. In fact, the actual contribution from co-financing to PMC was underestimated in the original submission. After additional consultation with partners the real contribution from co-financing to PMC has been increased to the maximum extent possible within the co-financing sources available for this project. Identified PMC co-financing will support staff time from the National Project Director and national /regional focal point, logistics, office spaces, two vehicles and additional coordination and administrative support of co-fin investments. Nevertheless, please note that the PMC co-financing identified is mostly needed to manage the high volume of financing provided and can only partially subsidize the PMC on the GEF grant which is already kept to the minimum possible. The nature of the co-financing sources is mostly made by grants with PMU costs entirely allocated.

Please also note the justification provided for the minor increase requested beyond the 5% PMC threshold: this project has a very complex institutional arrangements with three Implementing Agencies and two Executing Agencies + subcontractors. PMC will ensure that the program is delivered as one coherent project despite the five agencies involved. A very small portion of PMC resources will be used to build SODEFOR's capacity to execute in line with the results of their fiduciary assessments requiring significant mitigation measures to be supported before SODEFOR can receive funds (these capacity development efforts will be mostly funded by FAO's own co-financing).

3. Wording of Output 4.1 title has been amended throughout the document to reflect its? mainly national-level focus. It now reads: ?Knowledge products, tools and approaches regarding target landscapes and change processes, developed and shared at landscape, national and international levels, through CFI, the FOLUR Global Platform and other relevant platforms.?

4. Outcome 4 indicator has been added to Table B.

May 4

1. Addressed in portal cover as per Prodoc. This was not saved properly in the portal

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

March 8, 2021:

1. The co-financing letter from GIZ do not specify the type (in-kind/grant/public investment) of co-financing. Please provide a letter specifying it.
2. The co-financing letter from SODEFOR is in French. Please provide a translation in English, clearly specifying the contribution as grant and as in-kind.
3. Co-financing letter from MINADER CCC is not uploaded, nor described in ?Investment Mobilized? identification. Please complete as needed.

April 30, 2021:

1. Thank you for the information. Cleared.
2. We don't find the co-financing letter from SODEFOR in French and its translation in English. Please complete.
3. Thank you for the letter. Cleared.
4. In addition, the co-financing from UNDP is reported in Table C as "Grant" and "Recurrent expenditures". Usually grants as considered as investment mobilized. Please explain.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

1. GIZ has temporarily withdrawn its co-financing contribution to this project due to the uncertainties that COVID 19 is posing to their investments in the country. Moreover, GIZ grant has all PMU already allocated and overstretched and is not willing to contribute to any PMC co-financing. For the moment it has been excluded from the CEO Endorsement request. However, the Agencies are confident that GIZ co-financing will materialize during implementation through their project to support Green Innovation Centres for the Agriculture and Food Sector (GIC) in the region of Cavally. Effective collaboration will be ensured in any case. GIZ and FAO will also be partners in the EU sustainable Cocoa Initiative
2. The English version of the SODEFOR letter is embedded in the same .pdf as the French original.
3. MINADER ? Conseil Caf? y Cacao (CCC) co-financing letter has been obtained and uploaded. CCC will provide additional seedlings as in-kind co-financing in the regions of project intervention for an amount of 6 MLN USD. This represents a very good achievement for the project for replication of good agroforestry practices that the project will promote (see annex L).

In addition to the co-financing sources listed in Table B, for which written commitments have been secured, FAO is in close contact with the WB, which is currently formulating a ?Cocoa integrated value chain development project (PDIC)? with a value of approximately \$300 million, as well as a Forest Investment Project, phase 2 (FIP2), valued at \$100 million. We can expect significant synergies and possible additional investment mobilized from these sources to materialize during implementation. A similar logic applies to the EU sustainable Cocoa Initiative. These projects are both in pipeline and therefore not included in the ceo-endorsement request.

May 5

2 ? Letter re-uploaded. It was deleted by colleagues from portal helpline resulting from a misunderstanding.

4- Addressed

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

March 8, 2021:

1. The budget for travels is \$388,009. Please clarify how this budget has been estimated and for which purpose, and in particular regarding the international travels and FAO travels.
2. Please clarify what is expected to purchase under the item "6100 Non-expendable procurement" of the budget.

April 30, 2021:

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the revision and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

1. Thank you for this comment. The travel budget was indeed incorrect. International travels were overestimated. It has been revised downward as follows:

5021 Travel				
International travel- Participation in Regional commodity platform gatherings / discussions with private and public sector representatives / Travels of international trainers.	trip	19	5000	95,000
National travel PMU and Technical cts	trip	131	1000	131,000

Travel for FOLUR GCP training/workshops & meetings	trip	8	5,000	40,000
5021 Sub-total travel				266,000

Note that the travels administered by FAO are only USD 17,000 in total. These will be needed for national and international travels of the 2 consultants that will be recruited by FAO.

2. Constraints to the development of agricultural mechanization at the producer level are essentially financial and economic. SCOLUR will adopt a strategy in favour of agricultural mechanization by supporting farmers in their Cooperatives for the Use of Agricultural Equipment (CUMA). A list of equipment has been drawn up based on built, structured and adapted requests, which takes into account the need to professionalize and empower producer groups and operators. SCOLUR will subsidize small equipment purchasing. To avoid free handouts that may tend to impede sustainability, cooperatives will be expected to contribute the remainder. The equipment will be rented out at a reasonable fee under the watchful eye of the cooperative.

To avoid abuses related to collective property, SCOLUR will established CUMA operators? groups and provide them training on the proper use and maintenance. These are producer-investors consisting of members who are in charge of managing the equipment they receive from the project. Strategies will be devised under Output 2.3 to ensure purchase of additional equipment through micro-finance institutions to help sustain the CUMA. The CUMA will be launched with the joint procurement of 8 moto and 8 three-wheeled motorcycle trucks for each of eight cooperatives (i.e. two cooperatives supporting approximately 1,000 farmers each in each of four regions).

In addition, three nurseries in each of the four administrative regions will be supported to ensure supply of sufficient plants for the three landscapes, through provision and installation of powered-boreholes and irrigation systems. The investments of a total of \$90,000 for this small-scale agricultural equipment will enable replication of agroforestry models in the pilot sites and ensure the project?s landscape can be easily covered with the footprints of the proposed interventions. (See p. 54)

The resulting budget is as follows:

Non expendable for Cooperatives (8) and Tree Nurseries (12)			
Description	Unit cost	# units	Total cost (USD)
Three-wheeled motorcycles trucks	3,000	8	24,000
Tree planting digging machines	1000	6	6000
Moto	2,250	8	18,000
Nursery irrigation system	1,000	8	12,000
Solar powered-well	3,000	10	30,000
TOTAL			90,000

Justification for purchase of 1 4x4 vehicle: the project has secured two vehicles from Co-financing sources for the PMU (one from ICRAF and one from FAO). All project fuel and maintenance costs and driver salaries will also be co-financed. However, the extensive field work requires an additional vehicle deemed essential for the delivery of outputs. This will ensure on the ground delivery of the trainings, community

engagement efforts, monitoring of on-the-ground investments within the CFI and timely implementation of the sustainable intensification models. Moreover, ICRAF has informed that the vehicle they will provide in PMC co-financing may not be available full time, as it is shared with other projects.

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

March 17, 2021:

Please note that the "PPG Required" box under Part I/section F should be checked and amend accordingly.

April 30, 2021:

Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23 - The PPG required box is checked.

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

March 17, 2021:

1. In the Portal, for the core indicator 6.1, please indicate the anticipated start year of accounting.

2. In the "Annex E: GEF TF / LDCF/ SCCF Core Indicator Worksheet" of the Prodoc, please complete the information of expected GHG emission mitigation under the sub-core indicator 6.1.

April 30, 2021:

1. Cleared.

2. In the Annex E, the expected results should be under the column "CEO Endorsement" and not "MTR" or "TE". Please amend accordingly.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

1. Addressed.
2. Annex E has been completed.

May 4

2. Core Indicators Worksheet corrected.

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

March 17, 2021:

1. The current extent of the forest area is unclear: the remaining lowland forest area is said to be estimated at 99,200 km² but the national forest cover is 3.4 million ha in 2015 according to the FREL. Please explain.
2. It is unclear why the fact that consumers are becoming more and more demanding about the environmental quality and socio-economic conditions contributes to a barrier to barriers to sustainable intensification of agricultural practices and systems. Shouldn't it be on the contrary a good driver for sustainable transformation? Please explain.
3. Despite a rich baseline scenario, including certification programs as well as the sustainability program underway for some 15 years, we learn that deforestation has persisted at high levels and has even accelerated, especially in classified forests. While we understand the rationale of the proposed activities vis-a-vis the existing problems, it is unclear what will make this project differently to be successful. Please elaborate further on the barriers that prevented the existing sustainable initiatives to be successful.
4. Some consideration of potential impact of COVID-19 situation on the described background/baseline would be useful to clarify how the project is taking into account this new context as needed.

April 30, 2021:

1 and 2. The changes are not reflected in the Portal description. Please include the changes also in the Portal description of the project.

3 and 4. Thank you for the additional information and clarification. Cleared.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

1. The first figure appears to have been based on outdated sources and has been removed. Remaining figures are from Côte d'Ivoire's Forest Reference Emission Level (FREL) (2020) (p.16).

2. Indeed, consumer advocacy and awareness of sustainability issues rather poses a risk to Côte d'Ivoire's cocoa sector should it continue under business as usual, and thus is a driver of sustainable practices, rather than a barrier to same. This sentence has been deleted from the list of barriers (p.19).

3. The following explanation has been added to the Prodoc (see p.43-44).

A number of factors have combined to create an enhanced opportunity to finally and successfully address the challenge of sustainable cocoa production in Côte d'Ivoire. Together, these factors have lowered the barriers that have hindered the success of previous sustainability initiatives. They include:

? Demand-side pressures and incentives: A range of initiatives has increased the pressure on producing countries to address sustainability issues. These include both consumer-led initiatives like the Consumer Goods Forum (CGF) as well as regulatory tightening on the part of importing country Governments. For example, at the European Union (EU) level, under the pressure of public opinion and the industrial sector, various initiatives are being carried out, including Community legislative reforms designed to encourage the sustainable production of agricultural products and to support the confidence of European consumers in same. Among others, a regulation to halt and reverse deforestation to which the European Union is contributing on a global scale, is being finalized for presentation to the EU Parliament for approval in mid-2021. This context has given a substantial boost to ongoing dialogues about cocoa-related deforestation. The EU is expected to accompany these new regulations with consistent support to Côte d'Ivoire and other countries for its rapid implementation in the framework of the Sustainable Cocoa EU Initiative.

? Environmental factors: Decades of forest destruction and land over-exploitation may have reached a tipping point whereby sustainable intensification has become more of a necessity than a choice. ?New? lands for clearance and development are running out and cannot alone solve the production challenge. Meanwhile, loss of environmental services has become acute and a growing and increasingly well recognized threat to long-term livelihoods. The effects of climate change, including seasonal shifts in rainfall and temperatures, are also becoming apparent.

? Landscape strategies: Sustainable solutions are increasingly well demonstrated, captured and shared globally. There is a better way and countries are becoming more

aware and eager to apply it. A key element of this new model involves working cross-sectorally at landscape level. Major development partners, including the World Bank, are already using the GEF project as a basis for designing their own landscape-level initiatives, like the cocoa integrated value chain development project (PDIC) for \$300 million, or Forest Investment Project, phase 2 (FIP2) for \$100 million, both of which are currently in the WB pipeline.

? Timing: The above factors have combined to build momentum towards large-scale transformation. The CFI has captured the elements of this process in a program of technical work (Phase I) that has been setting the stage for investment in such change. The GEF project is one of the first one-the-ground initiatives working at this next stage of CFI implementation and has a crucial opportunity and responsibility in this regard.

? Passed political-military crisis of CI (1999-2011) accelerated negative processes such as deforestation resulting from uncontrolled exploitation of natural resources. After the first five years of peace reconstruction, the government and its partners have been able to focus their attention during the last five years on solving the underlying problems through policies and strategies consistent with the commitments made by the country. PNIA2 in agriculture, the national REDD+ strategy, the new forestry policy and strategy, the new forestry code, the new land tenure law, and the new national development plan, are mostly approved and beginning implementation following years of discussions and consensus building among stakeholders.

4. The following description of the actual and expected impact of COVID on the cocoa sector has been added at the beginning of the baseline section (p.21):

At a cross-cutting level, the COVID-19 crisis is expected to have a serious impact on Cote d'Ivoire's cocoa sector over the medium and long term and therefore poses a serious threat to the sector. Ongoing market uncertainty could affect farmers' decisions to create, renew, or maintain their cocoa plantations. This could lead to a reduction in yield levels, which would affect processing and chocolate companies in the long run. In turn, this will affect the income levels of cocoa farmers and cocoa workers.

The COVID-19 pandemic is also affecting many cocoa export destinations. Due to the strict health and social measures taken by government, the supply chain has been disrupted, affecting the volume and value of exports. Such supply chain disruptions also have the potential to limit farmers' access to inputs, such as fertilizers and plant protection products. Cocoa could face a further slump in the longer term as chocolate demand has slowed down in Europe. Demand is expected to fall as a direct result of contraction in economic growth, which will diminish consumer disposable income for luxury goods. The impact of the economic slowdown is likely to include lower retail sales in shops and, especially, in airport duty free stores.

Covid-19 has emphasized the vulnerability of the cocoa sector, while underlining the need to rigorously and systematically continue efforts to increase productivity and sustainability. Modernization of the sector would include increasing productivity through professionalization, encouraging new techniques, much more widespread use of best farming practices as well as better prices for the farmers

The ways in which the project design has taken account of these factors are presented as part of the project's risk analysis (p.77-78).

1 and 2 ? Reference to FREL further highlighted in the portal as well and sentence on consumer advocacy and awareness deleted (as per Prodoc).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 17, 2021:

1. Thank you for the extensive description of the baseline context which is indeed rich and relevant. To better understand how the FOLUR project will build on this baseline, please briefly indicate how it will articulate with all the identified project and programs (such as presented under "9. Other projects").

2. The map 1 "REDD+ Initiatives in Project Regions" is useful but the acronyms used are unclear. Please indicate what SAP, PIF and ERP stand for.

3. The regional special planning and development scheme (SRADT) is highlighted in the baseline. As it is a territorial tool, please confirm it is "special" and not "spatial".

4. The GEF project areas look bigger in map 1 than in map 2. Please clarify.

5. The land tenure rights is identified as a key drivers of unsustainable practices. While the baseline scenario explains the planning frameworks, it remains unclear on how this critical aspect is currently being dealt with by the authorities and what is still concretely lacking the project will need to consider. Please clarify.

6. Please complete the sentence "representing about 32% of global of..." under "2. Cocoa production practices and value chain".

7. Please update the sentence: "the results of which are expected by the end of 2020...".

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the adjustments and clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The following table has been adapted to describe areas of cooperation and the nature of the articulation between baseline projects and SCOLUR (see p. 26-27):

Table 1: Projects by region

Project / program	Areas of cooperation (Type of articulation)	Geographic indicators [1]
The Cocoa and Forests Initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Knowledge Management regarding target landscapes and change processes, developed and shared at landscape, national and international levels (Executant of some elements) 	CV, LM, GM
National Agricultural Investment Program (PNIA2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Provides framework for SCOLUR activities) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Framework for SCOLUR) 	N
REDD+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Framework for SCOLUR) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Framework for SCOLUR) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Framework for SCOLUR) - M&E for Avoided deforestation and degradation (Framework and monitoring for SCOLUR) 	CV, LM, GM, ID, N
Green Climate Fund / PROMIRE project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - M&E for Avoided deforestation and degradation (Supporting National REDD+ Body (SepREDD)) 	LM
GIZ Green Innovation Centers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	LM, GM, ID

Project / program	Areas of cooperation (Type of articulation)	Geographic indicators [1]
World Bank FIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder (SODEFOR)) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	CV, GM
ISLA program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (ISLA platform, framework for SCOLUR) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (SCOLUR builds on ISLA planning results) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (SCOLUR building on ISLA planning results) 	CV
Farm and Cooperative Investment Program (FCIP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes, particularly in cocoa farm microfinancing) 	N
Action pour l'élimination du travail des enfants dans les chaînes d'approvisionnement en Afrique (ACCEL-Africa)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (SCOLUR building on ACCEL results concerning decent labor) 	ID
Cocoa Life Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	GM
Cocoa Promise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems / Involved as stakeholder - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains / Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes 	LM
Initiative mondiale pour le développement et la prospérité des femmes (W-GDP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (W-GDP Framework for SCOLUR) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (SCOLUR building on W-GDP Framework and results) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (SCOLUR building on W-GDP Framework and results) 	LM

Project / program	Areas of cooperation (Type of articulation)	Geographic indicators [1]
Forever Chocolate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	CV, LM, GM, ID
WCF African Cocoa Initiative Phase 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	ID
Maximizing opportunities in cocoa activity (MOCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	ID
Nestlé Cocoa Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	CV
Olam Livelihood Charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	CV

Project / program	Areas of cooperation (Type of articulation)	Geographic indicators [1]
PAMOFOR	The World Bank's Rural Land Policy Improvement and Implementation Project (PAMOFOR) project, address land tenure as a main objective. PAMOFOR seeks to strengthen the government's capacity to implement the national rural land tenure security program and to register customary land rights in selected rural areas. This project is already working in six provinces, including La M? and Indenie Djuablin, where it is clarifying rural land rights in 659 villages and then demarcating the territories of these villages, issuing 53,400 land certificates in the project areas, 30% of which will be issued to women; creating or renewing and supporting 400 Village Rural Land Management Committees; and training 10,616 rural land professionals, 30% of whom will be women. (Provides land tenure baseline for project model implementation)	LM, ID
Partnership for Forests (F4P)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	LM, ID
Pro2GRN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of integrated landscape management systems (Involved as stakeholder) - Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) - Conservation and restoration of natural habitats (Sharing objectives and resources in same or neighboring landscapes) 	CV
Projet ECLIC (Elimination du travail des enfants dans la cacao-culture)	- Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (SCOLUR building on ECLIC results)	GM
Transformer l'education dans les communautés de cacao (TRECC)	- Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains (SCOLUR building on TRECC results)	CV, LM, GM, ID

[1] CV = Cavally, LM = La M?, GM = Gu?mon, ID = Ind?ni?-Djuablin, N = National level

2. A legend has been added to Map 1 (p.24).

3. The revised translation for the name of this tool is: "Regional planning and development scheme" (P.29)

4. Map 1 shows initially defined potential GEF target provinces, in line with CFI definitions (see newly added legend). Map 2 shows final selected GEF pilot landscapes, constituting portions of four provinces.

5. The following text has been added to the Prodoc:

Lack of secure land tenure is one of the main drivers that makes agriculture and forestry unsustainable. A majority of the people exploiting land in Cote d'Ivoire are not legally recognized land owners, even if some are recognized as owners by customary chiefs or are allowed by them to use the land in question. This situation creates challenges for long-term sustainable investments, like planting trees. Administrative procedures for recognizing land ownership have been set-up; however, a good deal remains to be done, with one key barrier being the cost of securing the official documentation needed to prove ownership. Thus, long-term investment in sustainable land management must take land tenure issues into account. (See p.20-21)

Previous and ongoing projects like the World Bank's Rural Land Policy Improvement and Implementation Project (PAMOFOR) project, address land tenure as a main objective or as a component. PAMOFOR seeks to strengthen the government's capacity to implement the national rural land tenure security program and to register customary land rights in selected rural areas. This project is already working in six provinces, including La M^o and Indenie Djuablin, where it is clarifying rural land rights in 659 villages and then demarcating the territories of these villages, issuing 53,400 land certificates in the project areas, 30% of which will be issued to women; creating or renewing and supporting 400 Village Rural Land Management Committees; and training 10,616 rural land professionals, 30% of whom will be women. (See p.28)

Working with, and building on the above baseline, the SCOLUR project will address land tenure under the following outputs:

OUTPUT	LAND TENURE ACTIVITY
1.2	Including land tenure aspects in ILMP's capacity building
1.3	Including land tenure aspects in ILMP's development
2.1	Selecting agroforestry sites among secured land tenure farms by synergistic projects like PAMOFOR
2.2	Contributing to farmers' awareness by clarifying land tenure rights as an asset in trainings
2.3	Including Land Tenure costs in business and financial sustainable cocoa landscapes models
3.2	Pilot support for acquisition of land certificates in not yet secured farms, as a tool to convince farmers to dedicate their lands to forest restoration*
3.3	Including land tenure as one of the main works to finance/cofinance/lend in any new landscape restoration scaling up investment

* Finally, land certificates are more critical in the case of conservation forestry. It will therefore be a greater incentive for those parcels where cocoa is no longer producing and where a return to conservation forestry is less profitable in the short term for farmers than other agricultural uses. Also, on restoration plots, it will provide an additional guarantee against encroachment or expropriation of the land by other legal or illegal agents.

6. Text has been revised to refer more clearly to "about 32% of global production" (see p.33).

7. This sentence has been revised to reflect new 2021 publication date.

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

March 19, 2021:

1. Please explain the criteria that were used to select the 3 targeted landscapes.
2. In the Theory of Change, the land tenure issue doesn't appear clearly among the drivers and this may be why we don't see clearly how the alternative scenario will overcome this problem (in addition to the output 3.3 focused on conservation and forest restoration). Please clarify.
3. The multi-stakeholder platforms will be strengthened to, among others, harmonize policies (output 1.1). Beyond the relevant dialogue, cooperation and synergies the platforms will allow, the work on policies in particular is unclear. Please elaborate further on the what policies will be considered and how their harmonization will happen through the platform.
4. Under the output 1.3, we learn that there will be detailed ILMP implementation plans in two-three contiguous villages per landscape. Please clarify (i) how the villages will be selected, (ii) what will be the difference in terms of ILMP implementation between the detailed ILMP and the non-detailed ILMP and (iii) how environmental benefits from improved management (core indicator 4.3) are expected to be obtained under the non-detailed ILMP.
5. The project will work with the "1 to 20 Partnership" (Output 2.3). This Partnership is not presented in the baseline nor among the project partners. Please clarify what is this partnership.
6. The output 2.4 will promote existing standards or national standards for Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana to increase the quantities of certified product. Please explain what will motivate more producers to be certified.
7. The output 3.2 will support forest restoration including through planting trees and seeding. Please confirm that only native species will be used.
8. Considering the importance of the neighboring country Ghana in the global production, there is a unique potential in the FOLUR IP for the transformation at scale of a global supply chain. Please elaborate further on the key specific engagements with Ghana and how they can be transformative.

April 30, 2021:

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

3. The explanation is about the policies and problems which is very relevant. Please complete indicating how the platform will contribute to harmonize the policies and ensure the new information is provided in the project description in the Portal.

4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Thank you for the complements. Cleared.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

1. The following text has been added to the prodoc:

The following criteria were considered in selecting the pilot landscapes (see p.47):

- o Proximity to gazetted forests (FC) and national parks to enhance biodiversity aspects (Examples: Mount Peko NP, Haut Sassandra FC);
- o Ongoing similar/complementary projects with which to synergize (Examples: FC Goin-D?b?, FC Cavally, PN Ta?, FC Du?kou?);
- o Belonging to one of the 9 pre-selected regions in the west of the country and, if possible, with forest straddling two regions (Examples: Gu?mon, Cavally, Nawa, San Pedro). Also, an attempt was made to create a window of opportunity for cross-border perspectives (area between National Park of Ta?, FC Haute Dodo and the Liberian border, (area between Natural Reserve of Mabi Yay, and protected areas in Ghanaian border);
- o A representative set of target landscapes appropriate for subsequent replication and scaling up;
- o Availability of fallows to be restored from former cocoa farms (More common in the east of the country);
- o Ecological connectivity zone between protected areas;
- o Receptivity/openness of local populations to innovations in sustainable cocoa production, particularly agroforestry systems;
- o Existence of areas where land tenure had been, or was in process of being, clarified, and;
- o Existence of positive local dynamics (support to projects or leadership of a local organization).

Using the above criteria, an initial long list of 18 landscapes was assessed in consultation with the Ministry of Forests and SODEFOR, leading to the selection of the three pilot landscapes in two stakeholder's consultation meetings involving a wide number of actors, including Regional Councils and community leaders.

2. ?Lack of secure land tenure? has been added to the green box titled ?Governance barriers / gaps contributing? in the theory of change (See p.46). See also discussion above re. land tenure.

3. The following text has been added to the prodoc (see p.19):

Côte d'Ivoire has created policies for agriculture and forest conservation that are well aligned in principle, including through the REDD process, the government's international climate commitments, as well as the alignment of different land use policies. However, application on the ground is often still incomplete and contradictory and, as a consequence, deforestation associated with agricultural production continues. There is a challenge to harmonize implementation of: (i) policies for forest conservation and restoration (implemented by the Ministry of Water and Forestry through its decentralized structures such as SODEFOR) on the one side; (ii) policies for agricultural development, notably cocoa (carried out by the Ministry of Agriculture, the Café-Cacao Council supported by ANADER and CNRA), and; (iii) land use policies. For example, while the general policy of land use planning (a methodological guide to the development and implementation of the Regional Land Development and Development Scheme (SRADT)[1]¹ recommends the conservation of lowlands for food crops, there are many oil palm farms developing there. Similarly, although the new forest code (Law No. 2014-427 of July 14, 2014,[2]² with the Forest Code, revised by Law 2019-675 of July 23, 2019[3]³) has recognized the ownership of farm trees by the farmer and recommends the adoption of agroforestry practices to restore tree cover, in practice, farmers continue to suffer from logging operators cutting down timber trees in cocoa farms. Furthermore, despite their conservation status, classified forests and some community forests are being replaced by farms—some of which even receive technical support from government agencies. Interventions by the cocoa industry's sustainability programs have had very little impact on deforestation and improving the living conditions of communities, as they are not connected to regional priorities and not sufficiently adapted to the local context. (See p.19, 3rd bullet).

4. The following text has been added to the prodoc (see p.51):

The landscapes where ILMPs will be developed cover several hundred thousand hectares each. Project activities—including conservation, reforestation and cocoa rehabilitation—will take place at various locations across these landscapes. The planning process at the landscape level will be promoted by the platforms. Considering the size of the landscapes, this landscape-level planning process will be subject to certain limitations in terms of level of detail for the spatial planning and involvement of stakeholders. For example, it will not be possible to involve every household in the landscape-level planning process, but only heads of villages. In order to be fully inclusive, this landscape-level planning process will further benefit from a village-level process that includes households of that village in the discussions. The project will support the landscape-level planning process and also the village-level planning process in 2-3 representative villages of each landscape. Replication of the village-level planning exercise will be a responsibility of the platforms that will train village heads, extension agents and other officials in the promotion of the fully inclusive village-level planning processes. The villages for the initial village-level planning will be selected as representative of the respective landscape based on such factors as: proximity to protected areas; areas of current land use conflicts; or areas identified in the landscape scale plans for the creation of forest corridors. Selection criteria will also include the size of the village (with priority given to larger size); the origin of the population (covering the main population groups of the landscape); and the willingness of the

village leaders to engage in this planning effort. Environmental benefits will be obtained from both the landscape-level and the village-level planning. The landscape-level planning will establish a consensus about areas for conservation, restoration, agricultural development zones (e.g. for cocoa, horticultural crops, oil palm, etc). The village-level planning process will translate these into finer scale local plans which will serve, *inter alia*, for the identification and resolution of land use conflicts.

5. The following text has been added to the prodoc (see p. 37-38):

The 'Partnership 1 for 20' is a collaboration among the United Nations Environment Programme, the European Union's REDD Facility and the Ivorian government, which aims to mobilize financial resources at the scale required (USD 1 billion) for the restoration of Ivorian forests. The Partnership is designed to encourage the development of sustainable agricultural production models, facilitate dialogue among stakeholders and help build partner capacity. The objectives of the partnership are well aligned with this project, and the partnership can play a key role in sustaining and scaling up the activities and achievements of the project. However, the partnership has not yet begun its work on the ground. The project team will coordinate with the partnership to encourage investments in activities that are closely aligned with those of this project. (see p.36)

6. The following text has been added to the prodoc (see p. 56)

Under this output, sustainable cocoa standards and certification systems will be tested at two levels. First, existing or ongoing standards such as ISO 3410 or national standards for Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana will be promoted in order to increase the quantities of certified product being sourced from within the target landscapes. The following text has been added (p.54) to the description of Output 2.4 to clarify this standard-related work:

This action will incentivize the participation of members of cocoa producer cooperatives in certification in the following ways:

- ? The expectation of receiving a bonus in the form of additional income;
- ? The prospect of benefiting from capacity building activities, particularly on good practices;
- ? The anticipation of receiving a better return on their production;
- ? The likelihood of having quality beans that will be better sold on the various markets;
- ? The opportunity of strengthening collaboration with local manufacturers.

7. The following sentence has been added to the description of Output 3.2 (p.58):

The project's land and forest restoration efforts will utilize only native species that are valued for their socio-economic, ecological fitness, genetic, and aesthetic benefits.

Please also note FAO's Environmental and Social safeguards include rigorous limitations on the use of exotic species. The Project Environmental and Social Management Plan also specifies that only native species will be used, with respect to work under components 2 and 3.

8. The following table has been added to the prodoc (see p. 99-100) to highlight areas of exchange and coordination between the Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana FOLUR projects:

Relevant strategic priorities (as defined under CFI)[4]⁴		FOLUR interventions and opportunities for regional-level cooperation
COTE D'IVOIRE	GHANA	
Development and implementation of the national cocoa traceability system by the end of 2019	Improve supply chain mapping, with 100% of cocoa sourcing traceable from farm to first purchase point by 31 December 2019	FOLUR CI & Ghana teams support the dissemination, exchanges and pilots to test and harmonize methods of both countries, in coordination with CFI
Development of a monitoring & evaluation mechanism to track progress, help steer actions and transparently report on these and be accountable, by the end of 2018;	Development of a monitoring & evaluation mechanism to track progress, help steer actions and transparently report and be accountable, by the end of 2018;	FOLUR CI will invest through SepREDD[5] ⁵ in M&E with respect to the common landscapes between CFI and SCOLUR, harmonizing M&E indicators with other national processes like REDD+. Same could be done with Ghana FOLUR M&E and CFI teams. Collaboration between the two FOLUR teams, within the framework of FOLUR knowledge platform, could then enhance homogeneity between metrics for FOLUR, REDD+ and CFI.
Implementation of pilot projects in the identified priority regions where all the actions related to protection, production and inclusion will start in October 2018, to test the new policies and actions using a landscape-level approach, and inform the overall design of the program for 2021- 2030;	Development of models for sustainable livelihoods and income diversification for cocoa farmers, including diversification, agricultural inter-cropping, development of shade-grown cocoa, and other income generation activities designed to boost and diversify household income, by the end of 2018	Exchanges between the two national FOLUR teams to compare methods before commencing field interventions, particularly in agroforestry and landscape level approach. Share/Capitalize knowledge to/from other projects included in FOLUR Platform
Development of agroforestry systems and promotion of sustainable and diversified sources of income for cocoa farmers, by the end of 2020	Build on activities and projects that already kick-started in Hotspot Intervention Areas (HIAs), to test new policies and actions related to protection, production and inclusion from October 2018 onwards, using a landscape-level approach	Exchanges among national FOLUR teams (CI & GH) to share methods before to engage field interventions, particularly in agroforestry and landscape level approach. Share/capitalize knowledge to/from other projects included in FOLUR Platform

Empowerment of farmers and local communities to support the inclusive implementation of the Initiative	Empowerment of farmers and local communities to support the inclusive implementation of the HIAs, in accordance with governance principles detailed in the GCFRP[6]°.	Exchanges between cooperatives from both countries to learn and capitalize from successful examples both prior to FOLUR and as innovated upon by FOLUR.
--	---	---

[1] MANUEL-SRAT.pdf (plan.gouv.ci)

[2] Code forestier ivoirien.pdf (www.gouv.ci)

[3] Le code forestier (eauxetforets.gouv.ci)

[4]

https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/uploaded/2018/08/CFI_CDI_EN_130818_printversion_3.pdf

https://www.idhsustainabletrade.com/uploaded/2018/08/Implementation_Plan_CFI_Ghana_070818_printversion_final2.pdf

[5] Permanent Secretary of REDD+ (C?te d'Ivoire)

[6] Ghana Cocoa Forest REDD+ Programme

May 4, 2021

The below text has been added to output 1.1 (page 50):

As outlined above, the main focus of policy coordination, or the coordination of the (currently incomplete) implementation of various existing policies at the landscape and community level, will be to overcome the contradictions and conflicts between 1) forest conservation policies vs agricultural development policies; 2) policies encouraging the conservation and increase of tree cover on farms vs the long-standing and still widespread practice of private logging companies removing timber trees from farm land without the legally required authorization of the farm owner; 3) policies targeting the priority use of lowland, irrigated lands for food crops in order to increase food security and income for small farmers vs the wide-spread occupation of such lowlands for cash crops such as oil palm by wealthy investors. Resolving these contradictions in policy implementation which lead to deforestation both within and outside protected areas, the continuous loss of tree cover on farms and to local farmers being pushed to less favorable farm land (and potentially encroaching protected areas) will require a constant dialogue between the local representatives of government agencies tasked with their

implementation (e.g. SODEFOR, ANADER, CNRA, OIPR - Office Ivoirien des Parcs et Réserves) as well as representatives of communities, private sector and development actors. This dialogue will be created by the landscape-level platforms where government and non-government actors, community representatives and cooperatives will meet under the facilitation of the regional prefect and possibly neutral facilitators where necessary. The platforms will discuss and agree on land use planning that will then inform the activities of the participant organizations and ensure that there is no space for ambiguity, for example in the location of the boundaries of protected areas, in the extent and applicable rules of logging concessions, or in the permitted uses of lowland areas for various types of agriculture. The platforms will also serve as an opportunity for representatives of communities, to examine the possibility of deploying Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure^[1] to promote secure tenure rights and equitable access to land, and to raise complaints, for example where they feel that their land use rights are not being respected by private companies or individuals, or even by government agencies. Land use maps agreed upon at the landscape platforms will be formally approved by the competent authorities (Regional Prefect, Regional Councils) and will then be distributed to the agencies and administrations concerned, as well as private companies operating in the area and communities. At community level, a further refinement of the land use plans will often be necessary to address more local land use issues and develop more detailed land use plans, and this process will take place with the participation of the entire community. A key assumption here is that the removal of ambiguity over land use questions is the first and most important step in the implementation of sustainable land use practices at the landscape scale. The platform as such is not an enforcement entity, although knowledge of land use laws and agreements within the landscape is an important facilitator and precondition of their enforcement by the competent authorities.

[1] <http://www.fao.org/3/i2801e/i2801e.pdf>

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 22, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 22, 2021:

Partially. In addition to CFI and the need to complete the coordination among the different stakeholders, the links with the baseline initiatives is not presented. Please elaborate further on how the project will build on and articulate with the key associated baseline initiatives to achieve its goals.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the additional input. Cleared.

Agency Response

Table 1 provides detail on how the SCOLUR project will interface with and build on specific baseline initiatives.

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

March 17, 2021:

For the GHG mitigation estimate, it is unclear how the area of deforestation avoided has been calculated. The Annex M refers to an area of intervention of 26,211.35 ha but, at the same time, 1- informs the area of forest loss of 121,135.60 ha from 2021-2025 serving as the basis for the calculation (1% deforestation being avoided) and 2- presents a table saying it is proposed to reduce deforestation of 3% annually for the total land area under sustainable management = 175,314 ha. Please clarify the calculation.

Also, please consider that the target of reducing the deforestation rate by only 1% is very low and actually difficult to monitor and attribute to the project. In other words, would the improved management of +500,000 ha of cocoa landscapes including integrated planning and private sector engagement would allow to avoid only 1,211 ha of deforestation over 20 years? Considering deforestation is the main environmental problem the project aims to combat, more ambition is expected. As a comparison, the GCF project, with a budget of \$11.8 million and similar activities over a much smaller area, can achieve a GHG mitigation of 5.5 Mt CO₂e, benefit to +600,000 stakeholders and have a nation-wide influence. The FIP project with a budget of \$15 million will directly benefit to 345,000 people...

April 30, 2021:

1. The estimate obtained with the Ex-ACT tool is not consistent with the rest of the information provided. Please ensure the GHG emission mitigation estimated with the Ex-ACT tool is consistent with the core indicators reported throughout all the

information provided including in the core indicator section of the Portal, the project result framework and the Annex E: GEF TF / LDCF/ SCCF Core Indicator Worksheet.

2. Also, we don't see from the project description a justification for reporting indirect climate benefits. Please consider reporting all the benefits estimated with the Ex-ACT tool as direct benefit under the core indicator 6.1.

3. Thank you for revising the number of beneficiaries. Cleared.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 21

Figures provided in the original submission were partially incorrect and have been revised. The project can expect to have spill-overs through avoided deforestation. The detailed lost areas can be found in the excel sheet "calculations" (See attachment in Annex M). Based on the Global Forest Change 2000 - 2019, (Hansen, et al. 2019) the sum of projected lost area in the coming four years (2022 to 2025) is approximately 94,642 ha. As a driver of deforestation, agriculture is estimated to cause 62 percent of deforestation in Cote d'Ivoire, 38 percent of which is attributable to cocoa cultivation. Considering this, under the baseline scenario, an estimated 22,297.64 ha would be deforested from cocoa cultivation in the project intervention landscape by 2025. In light of Cote d'Ivoire's Zero Deforestation Agriculture Policy aim by 2025 (2016), an ambitious assumption of 95 percent of avoided deforestation has been made for the target regions. This means that by enhancing integrated management of landscape, 21,182.76 ha will be preserved from deforestation.

The carbon-balance of this project amounts to **-4 384 300 tCO₂e** for a total period of **20 years** (4 years of implementation and 16 years of capitalization) and for a total area of intervention of **47 297.64 ha**, or **-4.6 tCO₂e** per hectare per year.

(Revised figures have been added to p. 13, 68 and Annex M).

Regarding beneficiaries, the original submission did not take into account a significant number of potential beneficiaries associated with indicator 4. Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (514,899 ha). Based on the expected replication of practices and knowledge dissemination, an estimated 208,300 people (of which 93,735 are female), will directly benefit from the project.

May 3

1. Addressed

2. Agreed and addressed.

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

March 22, 2021:

The coordination mechanisms (platforms) enhanced or put in place with the project are key to ensure the integration of the different stakeholders, sectors and level of interventions. After the project ends, it is unclear how these mechanisms will be maintained. Please explain.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

The following text has been added to the prodoc (see p. 67):

The sustainability of the multi-stakeholder platforms is a particular challenge. A key element here is the platforms' close connection with local government. The platforms will be anchored within the respective Regional Councils, which will provide the secretariat and will be formalized through order of the Prefect who represents the President of the Republic in the region. In Cote d'Ivoire, a region with its Regional Council is an administrative entity with legal personality and financial autonomy. Closer to local realities, land users and local investments, its mission is to organize collective life and the participation of people in the management of local affairs, to promote and achieve local development, to modernize the rural world, to improve the living environment, and to manage the landscape and its environment. For its continued funding, multi-stakeholder platforms could therefore benefit from the Regional Councils' operating budgets because of the many advantages they offer in coordinating all public and private initiatives in the region. Besides advocating the continued funding of the platforms from the Regional Council budgets, the project will also look into the possibility of attracting financial support from various stakeholders in the landscape, without however creating a financial dependence that could compromise the neutrality of the platforms. The current project will strengthen the technical capacities of the Regional Councils so that they will be able to conduct their functions in a participatory and inclusive manner.

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

March 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 23, 2021:

The contribution of the project to the policy and value chain engagement (equivalent to pillar B of the Global Platform), beyond the central role of CFI in the process, doesn't appear clearly in the description. Please briefly elaborate further on this aspect.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response
Apr 23

The following text has been added to the Prodoc (see p. 100):

The project is expected to make a significant contribution to Pillar B, on policy and value chain engagement. Support to the respective Pillar B components of the Global Program will include the following:

? Engaging private sector actors and organizations on policies, practices, analyses and financing towards sustainability outcomes: While there will be times when the project will engage with the CFI and WCF at a national level and as an entity and coalition, there will also be ample opportunity for the project to build company-specific relations at both national and landscape levels with the majority of the 35 chocolate and cocoa companies participating in the CFI. Indeed, this type of on-the-ground engagement is a key function, of the landscape-level platforms and associated planning exercises. These will offer important opportunities for the type of engagement envisaged here.

? Engaging public sector institutions and decision-makers on policies, practices, analyses and financing: The close participation of key national ministries, including the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINADER), the Ministry of Water and Forests (MINEF), the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, as well as the Coffee and Cocoa Council?which acts as the Secretariat of the CFI?enable the project to engage in each of these areas

? Advancing integrated strategies for targeted public and private sector engagement: Again, the project?s integrated landscape strategy approach is expected to generate significant lessons in this area.

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

March 23, 2021:

Thank you for the information provided. The category of stakeholders consulted
"Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities" is not checked with "Yes". Please amend
as they are included in the project.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response Addressed
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

March 23, 2021:

Thank you for the complete analysis and detailed plan. Nevertheless, we don't see
gender-sensitive indicators in the project's results framework. Please clarify and add
such indicators.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response
Apr 2021

Some gender-sensitive indicators were included in the initial results framework, however no gender-sensitive targets were specified. The following targets have now been added to the results framework (new text in italics):

- ? Output 1.1 re. multi-stakeholder platforms: ?2 regional and one inter-regional / landscape platforms operational, *with at least 40% participation of women?*
- ? Output 2.3 re. inclusive business models: ?At least one new innovative business model has been demonstrated as feasible and is being taken up by an increasing number of farmers and their partners, *including at least 35% women farmers?*
- ? Output 3.3 re. mechanisms to leverage investments and commitments: ?Three innovative mechanisms have been fully assessed for feasibility and pilot tested, *at least two of which involve the participation of women's groups?*
- ? Output 4.2 re. participation in FOLUR Global Platform: ?All relevant events are joined, *with at least 35% female representation?*

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

March 23, 2021:

1. Beyond the fact that "companies operating within the landscapes are being encouraged to work", the engagement of the private sector remains vague under this section. Please be more specific on the engagements of the different kind of private sector stakeholders involved in this project.

2. In addition, please clarify where is the "Box 1" the text is referring to.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

The following text has been added to the prodoc (see p. 78-79):

1 & 2. The SCOLUR project will engage with micro financial institutions (MFIs) and cocoa private companies that are members of the World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), as well as with selected traders to support the zero-deforestation and sustainable intensification cocoa production activities in the project landscapes. In addition to smallholder farmers and middlemen, the following stakeholders are involved and will be involved in the cocoa value chain and in project activities (See Box 1 below). During the PPG, several consultations were held, particularly involving the major chocolatiers, many of which expressed interest in cooperating with the project through the landscape platforms and other means. (See p.78-79)

Box 1: Engagement with main private sector stakeholders

Type of company	Role in cocoa value chain	Nature of engagement
Cooperatives	Cooperatives are composed of smallholder farmers that pay an annual fee to become members. Cooperatives support producers for the price negotiation of cocoa and its traceability. They collect cocoa beans from producers (members) and sell them to a trader/exporter or a chocolate manufacturer.	There are many cooperatives in the selected landscapes, and the project will not be able to work with all of them. At least two cooperatives per region will be selected at the beginning of the project (8 in total). Their engagement will be to actively participate in trainings, to adopt proposed and adapted sustainable production and restoration models. They will also benefit from the project's technical support.
Traders / grinders	Exporters: Generally established in seaport cities, they fall into three categories: (i) small and medium-sized exporting enterprises (SMEX), (ii) exporting cooperatives, and (iii) commercial companies. They export cocoa to be transacted in international markets to the various chocolate companies.	CFI company signatories are implementing activities that are directly aligned with the 4 components of the SCOLUR projects, including investments in: ? Achieving 100% traceability and ensuring cocoa is not leading to further deforestation. ? Promoting cocoa agroforestry and forest restoration ? Supporting farmers grow more cocoa on less land and engage in income generating
	Traders/Buyers: They refer to the category of actors who benefit from the financing of an exporting company that collects cocoa beans from cooperatives. They are often in direct contact with farmers to whom they provide materials, equipment and financial resources to collect the cocoa beans before they are delivered to the exporters.	
	Grinders: These are the entities who have the capacity to carry out the first processing of cocoa, (grinding). They sell the cocoa paste directly to chocolate companies. Grinders include Olam, Cargill or Barry-Callebaut companies.	

Type of company	Role in cocoa value chain	Nature of engagement
Chocolatiers	<p>These are the confectionery companies. The nine largest in the world, all present in Cote D'Ivoire, are: Mars Inc, Ferrero Group, Mondelez International, Meiji Co Ltd, Hershey Co, Nestle SA, Lindt & Spruengli AG, Ezaki Glico Co Ltd, Pladis and Kellogg Co. These chocolatiers are part of the World Cocoa Foundation and the Cocoa and Forests Initiative (CFI). The CFI is an active commitment of top cocoa-producing countries part of the WCF to end deforestation and restore forest areas through no further conversion of any forest land for cocoa production. The agreement committed the participating companies to develop and present a joint public-private framework of action named Joint Framework of Action of the Cocoa & Forests Initiative to address deforestation. To deliver the commitments set out in the Joint Framework of Action of the Cocoa & Forests Initiative, the WCF4 companies agreed to develop a detailed individual action plan that spells out the specific actions to be taken during the 2018-2022 period. The CFI companies, the government of Cote d'Ivoire and national stakeholders, have also agreed to start planning the second phase of the action plan covering the 2021-2030. 5 As for now, private sector companies are reticent to invest in zero-deforestation cocoa production activities as they expect to be provided by evidence and concrete examples from the field and at local producers' level. The SCOLUR project will bring this experience and evidence and to serve as input for the second phase of the above-mentioned action plan.</p>	<p>Specific areas of engagement will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? supporting participatory approaches and community based natural resource management; ? landscape and regional level collaboration and land use planning through multi-stakeholder platforms; ? monitoring, evaluation and learning. <p>Through WCF and in the framework of CFI, those companies are being engaged to complement SCOLUR investments in same components, to share results and methodologies and to co-finance the support to selected cooperatives that are sourcing cocoa to those companies.</p>
MFIs	<p>MFIs are operating widely in Cote D'Ivoire in agriculture, trade and services. There are 11 institutions operating in the project area and three institutions work across the four project regions: Union Nationale Des Cooperatives d'Epargne et de Credit (UNACOOPEC); Réseau des Caisses Mutuelles d'Epargne et de Credit (RCMEC); and CELPAID-Finances SA. While MFIs provide financial services for the agriculture, forestry and fisheries sectors, these are not adapted to the specific conditions and constraints of the forestry and agroforestry sectors, in particular the cocoa subsector.</p>	<p>Collaborate with SCOLUR to enhance their ability to invest in sustainable cocoa interventions and ensure robust environmental and social management systems are in place; SCOLUR will engage with MFIs to enhance their capacities in the provision microcredit lines taking into consideration the specific features of investment needed in the forestry and agroforestry sector (e.g. tenor, flexibility for the interest rate).</p> <p>Identify and test together adequate financial instruments to be used for the benefit of smallholders and/or cooperatives; while being respectful of environmental and social safeguards.</p>

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

March 23, 2021:

Thank you for the analysis including on the COVID-19 crisis. One detail: please clarify where is the "Project Progress Report (see section 9)" the text invites to consult.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

The project Progress report is one of the monitoring products of the project and is described in Section 9 of prodoc and portal "Monitoring and Evaluation". Text has been further streamlined to avoid misunderstandings.

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

March 22, 2021:

Thank you for the description of proposed the institutional arrangement. We take note of the executing role requested for FAO and UNDP and the justification provided and supported by the OFP. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

March 23, 2021:

Please complete considering the alignment of the project with the national priorities vis-a-vis UNFCCC (in addition to National Capacity Self-Assessment).

April 30, 2021:

We don't find the added text in the Portal. Please add the proposed complement under the section 7. Consistency with National Priorities.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

Cote d'Ivoire submitted its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) to UNFCCC in October 2016. The NDC commits the country to reducing GHG emissions due to deforestation and degradation by implementing a strategy to reduce such emissions, including through sustainable forest management and ambitious reforestation policies (REDD+). According to the latest NDC periodic update, Cote d'Ivoire plans to reconstitute 2,944,628 ha of forests from 2021 to 2030, at an average rate of 294,462.8 ha per year. The focus will be on Classified Forests with 2,117,918 ha or 72%, against 826,710 ha (28%) in the Rural Domain (DR). The deforestation reduction hypotheses relate to a reduction in the average rate of deforestation from 112,887 ha / year to an average of 32,500 ha / year between 2021 and 2030. The present project will make a significant contribution to this objective by preserving 21,182.76 ha from deforestation.

May 4

Additional text added in Section 7 as suggested both in Prodoc and in portal.

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

March 23, 2021:

1. Partially. Please complete specifying key deliverables and a timeline, including the budget. The budget is not clear as the knowledge Management approach is imbedded in component 4 which also includes Coordination, Collaboration and M&E.
2. Please correct "activities" on the top of the table under the Knowledge Management section.

April 30, 2021:

1. Thank you for the additional information. Nevertheless, there is no mention of the "project flagship report" in the Portal description (we don't find the text in the response being reported in the Portal). Is it the only deliverable? Please add a table with the main KM deliverables (rather than the kind of expenditures such as personnel, contracts...), timeline and budget.
2. Not addressed. Please correct.

May 4, 2021:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Apr 23

A key deliverable under the KM component will be a "project flagship report" on the factors underpinning landscape-level readiness for sustainable cocoa production and associated project impacts. The report will help to increase knowledge-based on actual experience of the most important levers for effecting change, most notably in deforestation rates, but also in other key impact indicators, with an emphasis on measuring contributions to SDGs. This report will be available by the end of Year 3 of the project.

Other deliverables will be produced on an intermittent basis beginning in Year 2 and will include analytical studies, policy briefs and a range of communication materials, including videos, brochures, website posts and blogs. Knowledge products will be developed based on lessons learned by the project and captured in technical reports.

A summary budget for knowledge management is shown below:

Outputs	Cost categories	Description	Budgeted amount
Output 4.1: Knowledge products, tools and approaches developed and shared at landscape, national and international levels, through CFI, the FOLUR Global Platform and other relevant platforms	Personnel	Senior sustainable cocoa expert will lead the process of dissemination of project-generated knowledge and lessons learned	17,000
		An innovation and dissemination expert will consolidate and package key innovations and technical learning into reports and publications	60,000
		Three innovation and dissemination advisors (one per landscape) will conduct field-level interviews aimed at identifying key innovations	55,000
	Contracts	Sub-contracts will be given for communication / dissemination of knowledge and learning will be communications (CFI/UNDP/GCP)	108,000
	Training	Sharing of knowledge products at events	30,000

Outputs	Cost categories	Description	Budgeted amount
Output 4.2: Participation of project team and partners in knowledge management and other activities of the FOLUR Global Platform, as well as in relevant international cocoa-related events	Travel	Travel budget to cover costs of attending FOLUR Global Platform events and participation in regional commodity platform gatherings / discussions with private and public sector representatives	95,000
Total			365,000

May 4

1. The final Knowledge Management deliverables will be determined through a survey planned for Project Year 1 in close coordination with the FOLUR Global Platform. Key KM deliverable will include:

Key KM Deliverables	Estimated Budget
KM needs assessment surveys to guide knowledge and outreach product development. - PY1	1,000
A ?project flagship report? on the factors underpinning landscape-level readiness for sustainable cocoa production and associated project impacts. The report will help to increase knowledge?based on actual experience?of the most important levers for effecting change, most notably in deforestation rates, but also in other key impact indicators, with an emphasis on measuring contributions to SDGs. - This report will be available by the end of Year 3 of the project.	8,000
6 Technical and Policy Briefs ? 2 per year from PY2	28,000
6 Lessons Learned /Innovation and replication briefs - 2 per year from PY2	26,000
5 national CFI/GCP knowledge sharing events ? 1 per year	20,000
3 regional CFI/GCP knowledge sharing events and policy dialogues PY1- 3 and 4	35,000
SCOLUR web site and blog posting - Ongoing	40,000
Total (excluding staff time and travels)	138,000

2 Addressed

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

March 17, 2021:

Under the M&E section, the description doesn't provide a detailed budget. Please provide a budgeted M&E plan.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 23

Addressed - The budget M&E plan is now provided and consistent with excel budget.

The text of this section has been slightly revised to address comments received from Corporate Units in FAO's internal appraisal

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

March 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 17, 2021:

The "annex B: Responses to project reviews" is missing. Please complete as needed.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the providing the missing annex. Cleared.

Agency Response Addressed
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 23, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
N/A

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 8, 2021:

The Council made comments at PFD level applying to all the child projects. Where relevant at child project level, they need to addressed. Please add in the Portal and the Prodoc under the Annex section the response Matrix related to the Council comments.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response Addressed
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 8, 2021:

The STAP made comments at PFD level applying to all the child projects. Where relevant at child project level, they need to be addressed. Please add in the Portal and the Prodoc under the Annex section the response Matrix related to the STAP comments.

April 30, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response Addressed
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 6, 2021:

Following the last GEF Council discussions, please resubmit and include the Checklist agreed between GEF and UNDP for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project and for the portion of the project implemented by UNDP.

March 23, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

In addition, thank you for providing the Environmental and Social Safeguard analysis (including child labor). In table 5 in the Portal, please inform the risk category with a "yes" for ESS 8: Gender Equality.

April 30, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

May 10, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the following comments:

1. On Budget: Implementation Capacity Development Specialist cost of \$84,980 can be charged to component 4 ? KM instead of PMC. This might help decrease the GEF-funded PMC.
2. On Core Indicators: Please ensure that Project Results Framework (Annex A) is aligned with GEF Core Indicators (outcomes). Project Results Framework does not currently include outcomes (514,899 ha) of the integrated landscape management plans.
3. On Co-financing: Investment co-financing from FAO comes from GCF, please indicate this in table C (?donor Agency?, ?GCF?), even if the letter is submitted by FAO.

May 10, 2021:

The Agency addressed the last comments made. The project can now be recommended for CEO Endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations