

Sustainable investments for large-scale rangeland restoration (STELARR)

Review PIF 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

5/11/2021

Review completed by PM

10/19/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

- Clarification question: Is the Rio Marker for CCM "1" and CCA "1" justified for this type of project? If so, please explain. And some more elaboration to that effect would be needed in the PIF, e.g. how the strengthened rangeland agenda will be promoted in climate change mitigation and adaptation agendas.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response The project will generate knowledge that will be incorporated into national and international policies to build rangeland resilience and contribute to climate change adaptation in rangelands. This has also been included within the PIF.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Not fully.

- Please refer to comments further below (in Part II) on the components and activities (outputs). In line with those comments, Table B may need to be slightly revised to reflect those. Furthermore, we expect a better elaboration of Table B at CEO approval stage (2nd step approval).

- The PMC must be co-financed as per GEF guidelines, proportional to the overall ratio. Currently there co-financing line for PMC is empty. Please also refer to comments below under co-financing.

07/27/2021: Not fully addressed.

While PMC co-financing has been included, the ratio is still much lower compared to the overall co-financing. Please strive for proportionality in this ratio (e.g. by increasing the in-kind contribution of ILRI and/or IUCN) or provide justification as to why this cannot be achieved.

10/19/2021: Not fully addressed.

PMC co-financing has been increased to 1 : 1.7, which is not fully proportional to 1 : 2 overall co-financing ratio. Please either increase the PMC co-financing to around \$355,306 to make it proportional or reduce the total co-financing accordingly. If that is not possible, a justification for the lower PMC co-financing rate should be provided for the consideration of the reviewer to make an policy exception.

11/23/2021: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to July 27 review:

The PCM cofinancing has been increased from \$100k to \$300k USD through reallocation of co-financing as well as additional co-financing from ILRI and IUCN. Revised and signed co-financing letters to be provided before CEO Approval is sought.

Agency response to October 19, 2021 review:

Cofinance has been adjusted to reflect to 1:2 ratio as recommended. This was achieved by moving \$55,306 of cofinance allocation from component 1 to PMC

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and

Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Not fully.

- Please clarify if some of the co-financing was not used for previously approved GEF projects (USFS in Jordan, Kuwait fund and Arab Fund, IFAD). Please note that it is not necessary to strive for a high co-financing at PIF stage - please include only viable co-financing.

- Please confirm if all expected co-financing is in grants?

- We would expect some co-financing from IUCN and ILRI, at least in kind. This may also be necessary to cover the co-financing portion of the PMC.

- The PIF text in co-financing includes projects that are not entered into the table C: HERD, GLF. These are more appropriately termed baseline projects. Please make the supporting text coherent with the table.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

10/19/2021: ADDITIONAL REQUEST:

As per table C all the donor agencies' co-financing is in 'grant?' for the listed projects. Usually, grants are not entirely used to pay for recurrent investments. Most (if not all) of these projects that aim to support the GEF project may be categorized as Investment Mobilized (in which case, an explanation on how this was identified is required). Please clarify. Also please spell out the complete name of ILRI instead of its acronym in table C.

11/23/2021: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- None of this funding has been used previously for co-financing GEF projects.
- Yes all co-financing is in grants.
- Yes some co-financing can be provided in-kind from ILRI and IUCN for such as staff costings or management costs.
- These reference to HERD and GLF in the co-financing section and moved.

Agency response to October 19, 2021 review:

We have recategorized co-financing investments as ?investments mobilized? and provided explanation of how these fit of acronyms for table C.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes, but one clarification question:

The agency fee appears to be above 9% ? For a \$2 million project, the agency fee is \$180,000.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response This has been reflected as \$180,000.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Clarification question:

- While a 640,000 ha target under 4.3 is welcomed, please elaborate on how it has been derived. Further, we expect that at CEO endorsement stage the target is linked to a theory of change, to be developed during PPG.
- Please estimate a number of beneficiaries. It would not be logical to have a target under 4.3 but no beneficiaries at all.
- In addition to core indicators, the project may want to develop other/intermediary indicators on capacity building as part of its M&E framework, e.g.: A global and sustainable platform anchored in IUCN or CGIAR (ILRI), a number of dialogues or events at global or regional levels, a number of publications submitted to peer-reviewed journals, a number of awareness campaigns, a number of regional training events.

07/27/2021: Not adequately addressed.

Targets for GEBs are a requirement for GEF funding. If well elaborated and justified through the ToC, indirect benefits can be accepted in this type of enabling projects. Please set targets, under 4.3 and estimate beneficiaries.

10/19/2021: Addressed.

Total target of 82,000 ha equally split to indicators 3 and 4 (no double counting).

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to 7/27/2021 review:

The project seeks to strengthen international commitment, national support for and investment in rangeland restoration and SLM of rangelands. This will be achieved through Component 1 work increasing knowledge, understanding and awareness of restoration opportunities and best practices, targeting both the private and public sector actors. And it will be achieved through Component 2 work targeting global fora and global policy and commitments for enhanced rangeland restoration.

A conservative estimate of the direct Global Environmental Benefits generated by this project can be made using the anticipated outputs of bankable investment proposals targeted under Output 1.2.2. and the associated awareness raising and dissemination and engagement campaigns to bring these investment opportunities to maturity (investment deals). The project expects to support the development of 5 bankable proposals valued at some \$50 million USD in total, and that identify viable and attractive investment opportunities in rangeland restoration and sustainable land management. Using a conservative estimate of \$610 USD per hectare of restoration^[1] resulting in some 82,000 ha under both restoration and SLM, split evenly (estimate to be refined during the PPG stage).

The project will directly benefit 16,552 people (8,302 women; 8,250 men), including private sector representatives, those from government, non-governmental organization and indigenous peoples groups. Benefits will derive from capacity building through rangeland dialogues, workshops and knowledge sharing facilitation meetings, empowering rangeland champions, intergovernmental dialogues and awareness raising meetings

^[1] [Duguma L, Minang P, Aynekulu E, Carsan S, Nzyoka J, Bah A, Jamnadass R. 2020. From Tree Planting to Tree Growing: Rethinking Ecosystem Restoration Through Trees. ICRAF Working Paper No 304. World Agroforestry. DOI: \[Project/Program taxonomy\]\(#\)](#)

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
05/18/2021: Not fully

- We are pleased to see this project focusing on Middle East & North Africa, Central Asia, and the Latin America & Caribbean regions. However, a short rationale should be provided why Sub-Saharan Africa may not be targeted, also in view that the presented rationale of the project states that 30% of rangelands are in Africa.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response We have included Africa (sub-saharan as well) because of the global scope of the project.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Not fully.

- The UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration needs to be described more prominently in this section. It may also serve as a partnership platform for this project and needs a mention there as well. It may become more important than the GLF in this regard. Please address throughout the PIF.

- The presentation of the baseline situation should be complemented with the identification of problems and barriers, helping to shape the project rationale. At this stage of later, a Theory of Change should show the proposed pathways for change.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

-We have tried to expand on this though it's difficult to do as not clear how UN Decade of ER will evolve.

- We have added some of the challenges into the baseline section

- We have elaborated a Theory of Change

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Comments on the Result framework:

- Output 1.1: The formulation is an outcome (knowledge and awareness strengthened) and difficult to measure. If possible, use a clear and SMART formulation for all outputs to reflect the expected results, the nature of the work, and if possible a quantification (latest at CEO approval stage).
- Activity 1.1.2: Is it really the establishment of databases we target in this activity? This formulation is raising questions about databases: pertinence, anchoring, operations, sustainability. Please clarify/revise.
- Activity 1.2.2: ? "Technical Assistance" maybe not the right formulation for this activity; it also raises the question who will be assisted? A global MSP should not serve like a PPG with technical assistance only. We understand that the ?platform? will provide access to new resources (knowledge, training, co-financing, partnerships, eventually grants) to promote the rangelands agenda, but not sure that ?technical assistance? is the right way of doing it.
- The same comment is applicable to the output 2.1 (improved evidence available is not sufficiently accurate).
- Activity 2.1.2: Same question than 1.1.2 about database, especially anchoring, operations, and sustainability.
- Activity 2.2.1: Consider whether rangelands agenda can promote intergovernmental discussion, also connected to several international agreements (Rio Conventions, transboundary agreements?).
- Please consider (in view of monitoring, evaluation, and budget issues) to include a separate M&E component in the logframe.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- I have done this in the logframe/results framework
- Changed this to dataplatform as this leaves more flexibility to develop appropriate mechanism for information consolidation and exchange.
- 1.2.2 changed slightly
- Changed 2.1 wording slightly
- I think they mean 2.1.1 ? global knowledge platform ? but I would argue that this is needed
- Have added this to 2.1.1.
- An M&E component has been added to the logframe and will be expanded upon in the development of the full proposal

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Are the project?/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Please refer to comments made above on the core indicators.

07/27/2021: Please refer to comments made above on the core indicators.

10/19/2021: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to 7/27/2021 review:

Revisions to and explanations for GEB targets have been provided as requested.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
05/18/2021: Clarification question.

- CSO is ticked "YES" but not included in the table?

07/27/2021: Addressed.

10/19/2021: ADDITIONAL REQUEST:

It is well noted that the projects include indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society, will be engaged in the project preparation. However, please provide a brief overview on any consultations that have been taken place with key stakeholders during project design, noting that this is a global project.

11/23/2021: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response
- Ok have added cso in the pastoral organisation box.

Agency response to October 19, 2021 review:

Preliminary consultations on the project have been conducted between IUCN, ILRI, IFAD, ICARDA and World Agroforestry. This information, as well as more detail on planned stakeholder engagement in the PPG stage, has been provided in Section 2. Stakeholders.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Not fully.

- First of all, please integrate gender issues in the result framework and description of components (it is absent there).
- Include in the gender section the role of women in such marginalized communities as the nomadic herders. It should be an essential entry point for change (health, COVID-19, education, food transformation?).
- The inequality between male and female among nomadic communities is a complex subject. It should be mentioned here and we would also expect some further elaboration at CEO approval stage as well as intermediary results (publications, analysis, report) on this issue.
- Finally, it appears that the boxes in the portal have not been ticked or somehow removed? Maybe this is a formatting issue - please retain the boxes and tick the "YES" boxes as appropriate.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Has been improved this
- Have added a paragraph on page 16/17

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Note:

Tick box in this section has disappeared. Please retain and tick as appropriate.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Not fully.

- Please elaborate on the climate risks to rangelands by providing further information. Consider inclusion of figures/numbers and references to make the case.

- Because, pastoralist communities are per definition mobile, somehow marginalized, and with recurrent conflicts with sedentary communities, risks related to the conditions of Violence, Conflict, and Fragility should be considered.

- The risk of COVID has been mentioned, please also elaborate on potential opportunities, preferably directly under the risk table.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

- Done

- Done

- Done

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: No.

Rather than listing different strategies and plans, we suggest summarizing the connection between rangelands and (1) multiple sectors (agriculture, land-use, water, home security) and (2) multiple international agreements (transboundary approaches, biodiversity, climate change, land degradation).

- A point could be made on how this project will produce information and tools for a better consideration of rangelands in the climate adaptation and mitigation agenda.

- Elaborate how this project will produce information and analysis to improve the justification and operationalization of LDN targets on rangelands. Including the consideration of DLDD issues, specifically drought.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Done

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Not fully.

- For a project that has knowledge as a main output and as important means to achieve its objectives, the presented approach in this section should be further elaborated and better structured. We expect a fully developed KM approach and plan at CEO endorsement, so at PIF stage, at least outline the KM approach in a more structured / phased way.

- Please also consider knowledge as a benefit of the project that will be created. So, the number of beneficiaries could be derived in line with the KM approach.

07/27/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Done

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: Yes.

10/19/2021: ADDITIONAL REQUEST:

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low. However, there is no ESS screening document attached to PIF and the Section 5. Risk mentioned about possible environmental and social risks briefly in page 20-22. Please attach the ESS screening document if it is available to the document section in the portal.

11/23/2021: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to October 19, 2021 review:

A preliminary ESMS has been conducted for the STELLAR project and is now uploaded on the GEF portal.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a - global project without ground activities in specific countries.

10/19/2021: CLARIFICATION REQUEST:

This project is global and most of the activities are taking place in no particular country. However, some activities listed in Table B and in the PIF seem to be taking place in countries, e.g.: (i) Partner countries develop consensus on rangelands and rangeland restoration (investment) pathways; (ii) Rangeland champions, including elected representatives and community leaders, women and youth, are supported to promote domestication of international commitments to rangeland restoration; (iii) Regional training events for key national partners to roll out private investment guidelines.

If indeed some activities may occur in GEF countries, OFP Letters of Endorsement are required for those countries. Please clarify if that is the case.

11/23/2021: Adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Agency response to October 19, 2021 review:

Project-supported activities are not anticipated to take place at the national, recipient country level. The PIF language has been revised to better reflect this.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

05/18/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

07/27/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

10/19/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

11/23/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends MSP PIF CEO approval.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Provide a Theory of Change.

- Further elaboration of several points as mentioned in the review sheet at PIF stage, including Table B.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	5/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/27/2021	

PIF Review Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)	10/19/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/23/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The investment of GEF LD global set-aside resources is in line with the GEF-7 LDFA objectives and fully justified. 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.

This GEF ID 10816 PIF entitled "Sustainable investments for large-scale rangeland restoration (STELARR)" is a Global MSP financed by the LD set aside. The project is proposed by IUCN as GEF Agency and the International Livestock Research Institute, ILRI, a CGIAR center as other executing partner. 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 and will be applied in PPG and the eventual project implementation as needed.

