



Sustainable investments for large-scale rangeland restoration (STELARR)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10816

Countries

Global

Project Name

Sustainable investments for large-scale rangeland restoration (STELARR)

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

9/1/2022

Review completed by PM

10/18/2022

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

However, what is unclear is how the co-financing actually contributes to the implementation of this project. This needs to be clarified in this case as the GEF budget includes several items that would usually be expected to be at least partly covered by co-financing. Please clarify.

10/18/2022:

- ILRI, ICARDA, ICRAF (all 9 entries): change ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment Mobilized?
- IUCN in-kind: unable to locate a co-financing letter. Please submit the co-financing letter

11/02/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

●

Agency Response

IUCN Response to 10_18_22 review comment: Co-financing reclassified to ?Investment Mobilized? for the 9 entries as suggested. IUCN co-financing letter uploaded.

[IUCN Response to 9/2/22 review comment](#): Additional text explaining the role of each of the co-financing sources has been added. As noted, co-financing comes from projects that STELLAR will work with and that provide additional in-kind resources, as well as generating data, evidence and lessons that STELLAR will use and benefit from. The text has been amended with the following:

? *Global Livestock Advocacy and Development (Phase 3: 2022-2024)* ? with funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and executed by ILRI, this project will support STELARR with advocacy and media campaigns in Component 2. It will also provide co-financing for the PMC. The GLAD is a project that aims to provide compelling evidence, well-presented and communicated, through targeted engagement processes to help investors and decision-makers understand why and how investing in sustainable livestock systems and enterprises in low- and middle-income countries contributes to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. This project will support STELARR with advocacy and media campaigns in Component 2. It will also provide co-financing for the PMC in terms of 5% time of the Project Lead and office supplies. (US\$915,000)

? *Rangeland Resource Assessment Across the Africa Continent for Improved Ecosystem Health and Sustainable Food Systems (2022-2023)* ? This project, led by ILRI and funded by UNEP, is consolidating big data on rangelands as a baseline of information on the status of rangelands and trends taking place in rangelands in Africa. This will be an important resource for STELARR and identification of rangeland restoration opportunities linked to livestock value chains in Component 1 and provision of information for the rangelands database in Component 2. (US\$95,000)

? *Kuwait Fund and Arab Fund for Social and Economic Development ? Enhancing Food Security and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources through Fostering Integrated Agricultural Production Systems in the Arabian Peninsula (2022-2023)* ? Led by ICARDA, the project will contribute to the national goals of the Arabian Peninsula countries through the development of more sustainable and resilient agricultural production systems, adapted to climate change, that enhance food security and reduce demands for imports, increase the resilience of farmers and farming systems to climatic change and enhance the capacity of these systems to sequester carbon and mitigate climate change including rangelands in Saudi Arabia, Oman, Qatar, Kuwait, UAE, Bahrain and Yemen. It will support Component 1 through opportunities to identify and work on livestock value chains, Component 2 in provision of information for the rangelands database, and Component 3 as areas for testing rangeland restoration monitoring framework. (US\$617,748)

? *Enhancing Agricultural Production Systems and Conserving Natural Resources in the Countries of the Arabian Peninsula (Fifth Phase: 2022-2023)* ? Led by ICARDA and working together with the above project, it will support Component 1 through opportunities to identify and work on livestock value chains, Component 2 in provision of information for the rangelands database, and Component 3 as areas for testing rangeland restoration monitoring framework. (US\$492,935)

? *Drylands Transform Project, Kenya (2022-2024)* - Funded through Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, it will provide lessons on rangeland restoration and indicators for use in STELARR's Component 3 (US\$50,000)

? *Twende Project, Kenya (2022-2024)* ? With funding from the Global Climate Fund, it will provide lessons on rangeland restoration and indicators for use in STELARR's Component 3 (US\$80,000)

? *Weather, water and climate services (WWCS) (2022-2025)* - WWCS are increasingly becoming key factors for the resilience and well-being of rural communities in Tajikistan. The multi-phase initiative launched by Caritas Switzerland (CaCH) and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) in Tajikistan attempts to operationalize the development and delivery of WWCS to pilot communities of Laksh and Muminabad with the ultimate goal of scaling lessons learnt to the national level. It will provide important lessons learned for STELLAR on the risks for investments in livestock value chains and rangeland restoration and tools to overcome them. (US\$199,365)

? *Accelerating the Impact of CGIAR Climate Research for Africa (AICCRA)(2021-2023)* - Funded by the World Bank, and expected by ILRI, AICCRA works to make climate information services and climate-smart agriculture more accessible to millions of smallholder farmers across Africa. With better access to technology and advisory services?linked to information about effective response measures?farmers can better anticipate climate-related events to take preventative action that helps their communities safeguard livelihoods and the environment. AICCRA has a strong component on rangelands and rangeland restoration including participatory rangeland management that will provide important input for the development of processes that can support rangeland restoration as part of livestock value chains, and will contribute lessons learned and data as contributions to Component 1, 2 and 3. (US\$132,000)

Local natural resource governance for community stabilization in Central Mali (2022-2025). The project is set to empower local communities for the implementation of collaborative management strategies of land and water resources at the local level. The activity is also designed to support livestock and feed values transformation as sources of livelihoods diversification for women and youth and as a strategy to help communities? transition and recover from conflict. It will contribute lessons learned on community driven (Local Conventions) Bourgou floodplains and upland grazing areas ecosystems restoration to Components 1 and 2 . (US\$1,500,000)

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

09/02/2022: Not fully. While Table D is adequate, the proposed budget is not considered cost-effective.

Observations and clarification requests on the budget:

a) Please indicate who is the responsible institution. If the budget is 100% managed by ILRI, please indicate under the budget table Annex E). If some budget lines are managed by other institutions, please add another column.

Basically, the budget includes the following items: salary and benefits / staff (988K\$), capacity building (513K\$ of workshop, consultants, meetings), and 190K\$ of travels.

b) Please justify the rather high costs for salary and benefits (project lead and 3 regional experts). Please provide detailed TOR for these positions our consideration. The main question is the justification of full-time staff (475K\$) as a project leader and justification why GEF would cover 100% of this position and its added value in view of the identified co-financing. We understand that the project may need additional staff to well execute the different activities. However, the proportion of staff covered from co-financing would be needed to better understand that the investment.

c) Please, note that GEF doesn't pay ?overheads?. This is ineligible, please remove from the budget. If this amount remains in the budget, please make sure that it invested in a way that directly contributes to the project objectives as per Table B.

d) In general, the PMC seem reasonable. However, please indicate how the PMC are co-financed.

e) ?Senior scientist managing component 3 ? 5% (26,488\$): Please provide TOR to understand the role and need for technical project support vs. management tasks, which should be covered by PMC.

f) ?office supplies? (\$48,777.67) should be covered by PMC.

g) We understand the need for travel. However, please justify the amount of \$190,000 by providing a more detailed breakdown.

10/18/2022: Addressed. Please refer to agency clarification below. The proposed arrangements are considered justified by the Program Manager.

Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN response to GEF Sec 9/2/22 review comments:

a) All of the budget will be managed by ILRI with the exception of \$15k USD for an independent Terminal Evaluation where IUCN will procure the services of an external firm for this task. A note explaining the above has been added below the budget.

b) Regarding the staff costs, according to ILRI: *?This project is a global project, focused on changing ways of doing by value chain actors, and creating incentives to do so. It works with value chain actors and projects supporting them, supported by research. It is not a project that directly implements activities on the ground but does this indirectly through the projects and value chains actors it works with ? this explains why STELARR has comparatively high staffing and travel costs and low operating costs.*

The project manager in the executing agency (ILRI) will be Fiona Flintan, Senior Scientist at ILRI, who will give 10% of her time to the management of the project ? 5% funded by the project PMC and 5% by co-financing from the ILRI-GLAD project. The manager of component 3 based at ICRAF will also be financed 5% by the project PMC and have 5% covered by co-financing

The only full-time position in the project is the Global Policy and Business Expert. This person will be hired solely for STELARR as a project personnel, whose employment will terminate with the completion of STELARR. The position is required to lead on all component 1 and component 2 tasks, which justifies the full-time position. In order to attract the right person, with the experience, expertise and skills required to engage with commercial value chain actors from local to global, with investors, scientists, donors and other stakeholders, and to work with partner projects that will come from co-financing an attractive salary package is required. It is anticipated that the right skills and expertise will only be found in someone who has previously worked in the private sector, including in livestock value chains, and to secure the right person an attractive salary package is a must. We have removed the line for consultants for the sector analysis as on reflection, this full-time business development expert should be the one to carry out such a sector analysis working with the CGIAR regional focal points. The TORs for the regional focal points are attached. The salary contribution for these roles and responsibilities is considered fair by ILRI.?

c) Apologies that the wrong budget was uploaded for prior submission. A correct budget with any associated support and administration costs included in each budget line has now been included as part of the revised submission.

d) The PMU will be led by Fiona Flintan whose salary will be covered 5% by the PMC and 5% by co-financing (ILRI-GLAD project). Co-financing will also cover all office supplies. Adjustments were made to the PMC to reflect the executing

agency's requirements. The PMC remains lower than the norm, and continues to respect the overall ratio of GEF to co-finance funding.

e) We accept the recommendation of the reviewers to place the cost of the ICRAF senior scientist managing Component 3 into the PMC. The description of the PMU has been changed to reflect this. The TORs of this position and the rangeland ecologist scientist are provided to show the different roles and responsibilities.

f) This component was erroneously labelled as 'office supplies' when it should have been labelled as 'Design and publication costs' and the expenditure category listed as 'Operating costs'. As the small description of this expenditure in the budget describes, this cost covers the design and printing of guidelines and other printed outputs from the project. Stationary and office supplies do not appear in the budget as they will be provided in-kind by the participating partners/organisations in the project as part of co-financing.

g) Travel costs have been reduced to \$154,700 USD. Please see breakdown below. We have taken the advice of the reviewers and reduced the travel amount, anticipating that some costs could be covered by co-financing projects. Otherwise, it should be noted that as much as possible meetings will be carried out virtually but it is important to have some funds allocated for travel as face-to-face as well and we have allocated what we consider a fair price for flights etc. in a context of increasing fuel prices. If further savings can be made during implementation we will do this.

Travel breakdown:

1) International travel of staff to engage with investors and VC actors in countries/regions of operation (COMPONENT 1: US\$30,700; COMPONENT 2: US\$23,800) - the project has committed to working in three regions with at least one livestock value chain in each. The LVC are likely to be in multiple countries. Partnerships will need to be developed regionally and globally - though as much of this as possible will be undertaken online, much will need to be undertaken face-to-face as will also require visits to the field, value chain areas, factories etc. and attending meetings to bring stakeholders together. The costs of consultants carrying out sector analysis will also need to be included. This also includes attending intergovernmental dialogues and media campaigns that strengthen LVCD. We anticipate at least 20 of such trips overall conducted by project manager, business developer and/or regional focal persons and sometimes key partners across the two components.

2) International and national travel for staff, consultant(s) and partners to develop standards for rangeland restoration including fieldwork ? (COMPONENT 3: US\$35,700) - In order to develop the indicators, protocol, monitoring framework including testing out the framework, the rangeland scientist will need to travel to the field, sometimes accompanied by other project staff such as regional focal persons,

Component 3 manager, business developer etc. At the very least s/he will need to make one visit to the field per year for each LVC, including local travel costs. There is likely to also be other field costs associated with research and collection of data related to impacts of rangeland restoration etc. for example data collectors. There will also be a need for the scientist to make at least 4 international trips for meetings related to the development of the monitoring framework and standard.

3) International travel of staff and partners to engage in regional and global dialogues for development of a global standard for livestock products reflecting sustainable production including investment in rangeland restoration ?

(COMPONENT 1: US\$35,700) - *In order to develop the standard, staff, focal points and partners will need to organize and contribute to at least 14 regional and global dialogues for the development of the global standard over the life of the project. Where possible this will be through already existing platforms such as Global Landscapes Forum or annual meetings of sustainable livestock roundtables etc.*

4) National and international travel staff and partners including rangelands champions to promote LVCs for rangeland restoration (COMPONENT 2:

US\$23,800) - *Global lobbying and advocacy on rangelands restoration and more specifically rangeland restoration through livestock value chains is an important part of the project particularly in year 2 and 2.5. This will include at least 4 trips per year for sharing the results of the project, introduction and presentation of the standard and related monitoring system, plus influencing investors and financiers to invest in rangeland restoration through LVCs, based on project experiences. This will be both through a targeted engagement strategy, plus also taking up new engagement and visibility opportunities as they arise. This work will be done closely with ILRI's GLAD project that has a particular stream of work on rangelands. It will include the identification and support for rangelands champions particularly in or with entry points to the commercial sector.*

5) Travel for Project M&E (Component 3: \$5000) - *The CG system has a unified and harmonized M&E system. ILRI will collect information on project performance for quarterly and annual reporting from this system, as provided by the sub-executing/sister agencies. This is guaranteed to meet ILRI's standards. In addition, an M&E officer will be responsible for monitoring progress of the project against its TOC and Core Indicators. The M&E officer will make monitoring missions to follow up on partner reporting as deemed necessary.*

Additional note: The savings made from reduced travel and consultant(s) has been redirected to the establishment of a global rangelands data platform by the project bringing together all data on rangelands and rangeland restoration opportunities by the project, and which will be a good legacy product from the project and as a contribution to the 2026 International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists. This was in the original

proposal but had been removed due to lack of funds; with the above savings it has not been reinstated.

Therefore ACTIVITY 2.1.1 has been changed to "Data and information on rangelands and rangeland restoration opportunities and benefits is incorporated into a new global rangelands data platform", and the indicators have been adjusted accordingly.

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

09/02/2022: Clarification request:

Table C indicates a Balance. Please indicate in the table whether this is "committed" or if the balance will be returned to the GEF trust fund.

10/18/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN Response to 9/2/22 review comment:

The balance of PPG funding has been committed to holding further stakeholder consultations prior to the Inception Workshop, and raising awareness in international events that would be occurring prior to MSP project approval so as to maintain the momentum after GLF-Africa. Consultations would include commercial actors in the Livestock Value Chain that would potentially be involved in the STELARR project.

The following text has been added to the revised MSP:

At the Global Landscape Forum Africa 2022, ILRI, IUCN and GLF's Sustainable Finance Team jointly convened a consultative Session on "Financing sustainable livestock value chains for rangeland restoration" as part of the PPG phase of STELARR. It brought together corporate stakeholders, organizations, researchers and individuals working with products from different rangeland sectors. The objective was to discuss how the linkages between sustainable livestock value chains and rangeland restoration can be strengthened, and investment in rangeland restoration improved and scaled-up. The session showed how important it is to address the root causes of persistent misconceptions, including that rangelands are wastelands. Rangeland values are consistently underestimated despite their immense economic, environmental, cultural and social values, and this includes their carbon sequestration potential for carbon markets.

An example from Mongolia was given at this Session, focusing on how the cashmere trade exemplified the challenges of balancing sustainable land use and economic gain. There is no market differentiation of sustainably produced cashmere and therefore little incentives for land restoration. However, the consumers are becoming more aware and are demanding for accountability and traceability of the products they use, and this is driving more sustainable production. Big fashion brands are investing more in their ESG processes, and product certification will play an important role.

With 54% of terrestrial surface classified as rangelands, there is a huge potential for carbon sequestration from restoring rangelands still remains to be tapped. The session stressed that carbon financing has allow pastoralists to hold equity in the carbon projects, and be inclusive for women and youth. Investment should be not only be made in land economics but should consider the long-term the productivity of animals and the land, preservation of cultures and support of livelihoods, the Session concluded.

The balance from the GEF trust fund will be used to hold further consultations at the beginning of the project.

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

However, please clarify why the targets are listed under 4.1: "Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity" instead of 4.3: "Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems". The latter would seem to be more appropriate.

In view of the modest number of beneficiaries, the area target may need to be reduced and/or the number of beneficiaries brought into a better proportion.

Please also provide a short explanation under the table how the target has been derived at (as provided in the text under GEBs).

10/18/2022: Please address:

- The target at CEO endorsement for indicator 3, Area of land and ecosystems under restoration, is missing in the core indicator and results framework table.
- The target for indicator 11 in the core indicator table, does not match the target in the results framework (annex A).

11/02/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN Response to 10_18_22 review comment:

The PIF includes a target of 41,000 ha under both Core Indicators 3 and 4. At CEO Endorsement stage, project technical leads understand the PIF targets to be double counting. The CEO ER includes a target under ha under restoration only, and this target is higher than what is in the PIF.

The targets in Annex A (Results framework) now match the targets in the online Portal for both Indicators 3.3 and 11

IUCN response to 9/2/22 review comment: The initial online submission made an error and used target 4.1 instead of 4.3. This has been corrected.

The calculation of number of beneficiaries was based on only those directly benefiting from the project (i.e. involved in the pilot livestock value chains). For that reason, the target is modest compared to number of hectares that was calculated based on indirect benefits.

New calculations have been made of the indirect benefits to beneficiaries, based on an average human population density in the project regions applied to the number of hectares listed in Core Indicator 4.3. The details of this calculation have been added to the Core Indicators Worksheet Table, and the text under GEBs has been revised as follows:

? In addition, it is estimated that with an average pastoralist population density of 0.0942 people per ha, applied to the expected GEB of 6 million hectares, then the total indirect beneficiaries will be 565,200 people. With an average gender ratio today of 50.4% male, 49.6% female, then the total indirect beneficiaries will be 284,860 male and 280,339 female (including children).

The total number of beneficiaries therefore, combining both direct and indirect, is expected to be 572,400, of whom 285,740 are female and 286,660 are male. ?

The following text from the MSP has been added under the online table format as requested:

Despite the lack of accurate, up to date and verified data on rangeland degradation in the target regions, an updated estimate has been made of the GEBs that would be generated through the impacts and outcomes of this project by taking data from the Rangeland Atlas showing that the land classified as rangeland^[1] in the 3 target regions comes to a

total of 4,506 million hectares (see Annex for more details). Taking only the top 10 countries in each region with the highest area of rangeland, brings us to a total of 2,218 million hectares of rangeland. According to the World Desertification Atlas (3rd edition), these regions are experiencing decreasing productivity in 22-35% of the rangelands. Therefore, there is a total estimated 604 million ha of degraded rangeland. The Drylands Sustainable Livelihoods IP assumes that its Child projects will impact 10% of degraded land. However, STELARR is primarily an enabling project, therefore its impact will be indirect and in such a short time period, will likely impact only 1% of degraded rangelands. Thus we can estimate that STELARR's outcomes will indirectly generate GEBs from rangelands sustainable management on 6 million hectares of degraded rangeland (Core Indicator 4.3).

In addition, the number of beneficiaries benefiting from the project was calculated based on an estimated average density of pastoralist populations in a sample of 6 countries in the project regions where data exists. An average pastoralist population density of 0.0942 people per ha, applied to the expected GEB of 6 million hectares, gives an estimated total beneficiaries of 565,200 people. With an average sex ratio today of 50.4% male, 49.6% female, then the total beneficiaries will be 284,860 male and 280,340 female (including children).

[1] Rangeland Atlas classification is based on WWF eco-zones, and the rangeland class includes: desert and xeric shrublands, flooded grasslands and savannah, Mediterranean forest woodland and scrub, tropical and sub-tropical grasslands, savannas and shrublands.

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency 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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency 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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

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

n/a for a global project

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

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

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes, however, please note clarification requests made above on the Budget table (Annex E).

10/18/2022: A revised budget table has been submitted.

HOWEVER, the right side margins of Annex A and Annex E are both outside the printable range, please narrow the column so that they are within the portal margins.

11/02/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

IUCN Response to 10_18_22 review comment:

Columns in both Annex A and E have been narrowed and uploaded. We hope both Annexes are fully visible now.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

09/02/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for a MSP

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a for a MSP

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

see comments to Annex C above

10/18/2022: A revised table has been submitted.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request has been provided

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

09/02/2022: Please address clarification requests made in this review.

10/18/2022: No. Please address outstanding comments. The re-submission needs to address formatting issue (Annex A, E are pasted outside printable margins).

11/02/2022: Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	9/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The comments by GPU and PPO made in the joint sequential review have been addressed in the re-submission.

CEO COVER MEMO:

This project ?Sustainable investments for large-scale rangeland restoration (STELARR)? is a Global MSP financed by the LD set aside. Rangelands occupy approximately 54% of all land on earth, they are home to 30% of all species, contain one third of all soil carbon, and are grazing areas for 35% of the world?s sheep, 23% of the goats, and 16% of the cattle and water buffalo. Rangelands support the livelihoods of very poor and often marginalized communities essentially in LDCs and drylands areas. Properly managed rangelands can provide global environment benefits, ecosystem services (food, fiber, water, carbon ? potentially additional 1,300-2,000 MtCO₂e by 2030), food security, and poverty alleviation to at least half a billion livestock keepers, and make a strong contribution to national economies.

The project is implemented by IUCN as GEF Agency and the International Livestock Research Institute, ILRI, a CGIAR center as executing agency. The project aims to raise the profile of these ecosystems with the objective to strengthen international commitment, national support and investment for rangeland restoration. The project will also help to promote the UNCCD agenda by increasing the consideration of rangelands

in the NAPs under the UNCCD and the voluntary LDN targets. It will also promote restoration of rangelands within the UN Decade for Ecosystem Restoration and strengthen nature-based solutions in the context of 2030 agenda and before the International Year of Rangelands and Pastoralists planned in 2026.

Adequate COVID 19 risk mitigation measures are described in the project documents and will be applied in project implementation as appropriate.