

Promoting Sustainable Agricultural Production and Conservation of Key Biodiversity Species through Land Restoration and Efficient Use of Ecosystems in the Dallol Bosso and Surrounding Areas (PROSAP/COKEBIOS)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10420

Countries

Niger

Project Name

Promoting Sustainable Agricultural Production and Conservation of Key Biodiversity Species through Land Restoration and Efficient Use of Ecosystems in the Dallol Bosso and Surrounding Areas (PROSAP/COKEBIOS)

Agenices

IFAD, UNEP

Date received by PM

10/14/2019

Review completed by PM

11/6/2019

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- About LD and the use of the LD 2.5 objective, please refer to the STAP guidelines (<http://www.stapgef.org/guidelines-land-degradation-neutrality>) and the UNCCD SPI Paper to Create an Enabling Environment for Land Degradation Neutrality and Its Potential Contribution to Enhancing Well-Being, Livelihoods and the Environment (<https://knowledge.unccd.int/publication/creating-enabling-environment-land-degradation-neutrality-and-its-potential>).
- What are the suggested GEBs associated with the use of the BD resources for BD-1-1 (Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors)?
- The link with the GEF7 CCM strategy and the justification for the use of CCM STAR resources is weak: Please, understand that the GEF – in the current cycle of GEF7- does not really finance single technologies when they are not associated to more integrated approaches (like mini-grids with storage or integrated/multi-technology solutions for energy efficiency in buildings).

11-4-19

Considering the investments needed for the effective management of the protected areas, suggest moving to BD-2-7 Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate.

November 6, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

With thanks, we have taken note of the recommendations and comments from the GEF Secretariat. In response:

1. We have revised the narrative of LD 2.5 to reflect the recommendations of the STAP guidelines as well as the UNCCD SPI for the creation of an enabling environment for LDN and its potential contribution to well-being, livelihoods, and environment. Ref: Project Framework, component 1 and related footnotes; Project Area description and Baseline description and Project Alternative sub-sections
2. The BD-1-1 resources for this project will be invested in the software activities related to institutional frameworks and land use plans to improve the management of the landscape for the improved conservation efforts of giraffes and hippos. Therefore, GEBs in terms of the conservation of the burgeoning population of giraffes and hippos will be indirect – resulting from improved management of the landscape, the species' habitat. Reference; Project Framework outputs 2.1.1; 2.1.2; 2.2.2 and Section 3.1 GEB
3. Noting and acknowledging the GEF Secretariat's comment on CCM, appropriate adjustments have been made to re-allocate CCM resources (using marginal adjustment flexibility mechanism – See revised LoE) to LD related interventions in component 3.

Addressing comment 04-11-19

The funding from BD-1-1 Biodiversity Mainstreaming in Priority Sectors has been moved to BD-2-7 Improving Financial Sustainability, Effective Management and Ecosystem Coverage of the Global Protected Area Estate

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

Component 1:

- Please, check the list of proposed outputs with the UNCCD SPI paper on creating an enabling environment for LDN and the STAP guidelines on LDN and revise if needed (1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, and 1.1.5).
- About the need for integration and a revision of institutional mechanisms and platforms, please take inspiration from key documents on the subject and associated themes: Integrated Management Systems and Sustainable Development: (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323915744_Integrated_Management_Systems_and_Sustainable_Development), Denier, L., Scherr, S., Shames, S., Chatterton, P., Hovani, L. and Stam, N. (2015). The Little Sustainable Landscapes Book, Global Canopy Programme: Oxford; Sayer, J., et al. 2013. Ten principles for a landscape approach to reconciling agriculture, conservation, and other competing land uses. PNAS 110(21): 8349-8356; on governance: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0169796X15603236?icid=int.sj-challenge-page.similar-articles.3>; on sustainability: http://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/DURABILITY_web%20posting_0.pdf; on Drought <https://knowledge.unccd.int/publication/land-management-and-drought-mitigation-science-policy-brief>

Component 2

- The use GEF resources for the creation of the Protected Area (IUCN-V) for the conservation of Giraffes and the Sanctuary for the conservation of Hippos is fully justified under the Biodiversity Strategy in GEF-7. The fact that the Sanctuary for Hippos will not have a formal designation is of concern as that would make the area vulnerable. Is it realistic to think that a "land use plan will effectively provide sufficient land for the species to continue its presence in the area and reduce the human-wildlife conflict through continuing expanding agricultural and pastoral practices in the grazing areas of this species"? Could one of the IUCN categories and proper gazetting be considered for both areas? Please provide the approximate area of the proposed Protected Area and Sanctuary. One figure is presented in the indicators.
- The investments in support of the institutional & technical capacity, enabling policies (e.g. management plans) and infrastructure to manage the Giraffe Protected Area and Hippo Sanctuary are also well received. Suggest increasing the financial resources for this component to ensure there are financial resources to create the areas and provide them with the necessary infrastructure (e.g. tourism information centers, surveillance points, water ponds, observation towers, habitat restoration sites, picnic areas, awareness materials, etc.). The project appears to be over-promising and likely to under-delivering with the proposed outputs and allocated budget.
- What is the estimated cost of the rehabilitation of the 34,987.5 ha of degraded tiger bushes and bourgoutieres for giraffe and hippos' habitat, respectively and what are the proposed interventions? Has the "simple" removal of the drivers of degradation be considered as the restoration tool, or are these 34.9K ha to be subject to active restoration practices?

- The budget for this component and the proposed activities (Protected Areas + Restoration + Restoration + Income generation activities) is going to be insufficient to deliver all the proposed outputs. Please consider reallocating the BD resources targeting BD-1-1 to BD-2-7.
- What are the most likely private sector investors to provide funds for deliverable of output 2.2.2? This should be known by now.
- Please explain how the output 2.2.1 will be sustainable.
- Please, explain the logic and the usefulness of "business plans for investments". What is the institutional framework for these plans? Have you ever experimented such plan? what are the lessons?

Component 3 and 4:

- Please, take note that the activities that would generate emission reductions through land-use activities (approximately 150,000 tons) are not eligible under CCM STAR in GEF7, out of the Impact Programs.
- The numbers under the output 3.3.1. (approx. 2,000 tons) and output 4.1.2. (approx. 3,000 tons) are very low. We are not seeing a cost-efficient climate mitigation investment.
- It is difficult to be conclusive if the renewable energy component (solar) is eligible, as the text lack of details; but these activities seem a duplication of what exists under an existing IFAD-GCF project: “Line of credit for low emission and climate resilient smallholder agriculture: The objective of this project is to increase resilience of smallholders to climate change, Farmer Organizations (FOs) including youth and women organizations, cooperatives and small and medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) in Niger to climate change by removing barriers to access financial and non-financial services for adopting and implementing best adaptation measures in agriculture and Ecosystem- Based Adaptation (EbA) and the use of Renewable Energy Technologies (RETs) for agriculture through incentives schemes. This is an €8.5 million GCF-IFAD project that is focused on innovative financing mechanism to foster the best adaptation practices and use of renewable energy along agricultural value chains, capacity building and technical assistance for forest organisations, cooperatives and micro, MSMEs, National Agricultural Development Bank (BAGRI) and Micro Finance institutions (MFIs), and incentive scheme to encourage MFIs, FOS, cooperatives and MSMEs to adopt adaptation and mitigation measures.”

11-4-19

Component 2

Change the Financing Type from "Technical Assistance" to "Investment". It is virtually impossible to deliver the suggested support to the Protected Areas with Technical Assistance only. Furthermore, for the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary (1,000 ha), Land Use Planning is unlikely to deliver protection to the hippos unless it is

accompanied with actual Investments to work out the implementation needs of the areas. The suggested “Institutional and technical capacity, an enabling policy environment to operationalize the management of the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary” is a very soft approach to address very concrete needs on the ground.

Not clear who the project could use GEF \$1.2 million to “catalytically support the land use and management plans for the land rehabilitation of works”. How can land use and management plans for 34,987 ha cost \$1.2 million? That is \$34/hectare for just planning?

November 6, 2019

Point taken. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

31-10-19

With thanks, we have noted the detailed recommendations and comments from the GEF Secretariat. In response:

1. Component 1 comments:

- Comment 1: We have referred to the STAP and UNCCD SPI guidelines as recommended and appropriate adjustments made to the outputs where needed, reflecting the four enabling environment criteria in UNCCD SPI paper.
- Comment 2: The guidance is very well noted. During the PPG, the indicated resources will be used to define activities to be carried out in relation to integration and a revision of institutional mechanisms and platforms.

2. Component 2

- Comment 1: In this revised version, after additional consultations, it has been revealed that the area planned for the hippo sanctuary already has already been established as a PA by decree signed in July 2017 by the President of Niger. Please find attached as Annex the Decree of the creation of the Hippo Sanctuary and Kandadji PA. The PIF document has been adjusted to reflect this, and the current version has recast the hippo sanctuary-related interventions towards institutional and technical capacity, an enabling policy environment to operationalize the management of the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary.

-

- Comment 2: The guidance is noted with thanks. The allocated funds for component 2 is now been increased.

-

- Comment 3: In Niger, land rehabilitation cost is approximated at \$340 per ha. Therefore, rehabilitating 34,987.5 ha will cost about \$11.9 million. This includes transaction costs, land preparation, the labour involved, seedlings, planting and management after planting. \$1.2 million of GEF resources will be allocated to catalytically support the land use and management plans for the land rehabilitation of works. Of these GEF resources, \$0.85 million and \$0.35 million will be allocated to the degraded tiger bushes and bourgoutieres for giraffe and hippos' habitats, respectively. These GEF resources will be leveraged by already mobilized grant resources in cofinance, that is, \$85 million from IFAD, \$10 million from West African Development Bank, and \$2 million from World Resources Institute.

The proposed intervention for the rehabilitation of the 34,987.5 ha of degraded tiger bushes will consist of two approaches: alternative income generating activities (e.g. ecotourism, NTFP valorisation) that reduce exploitation of land and tiger bushes; and direct rehabilitation of land through planting the tiger bushes area with due respect of hydrological dynamic of that typical landscape, which are the landrace of the Dollol Bosso landscape – drawing lessons from Community Action Programs in Lido commune, GEF-World Bank funded in Niger.

The use of land use plans (LUPs) to improve the management of hippos has been further substantiated, reflecting the current land uses, prevailing land tenure (communal) and community livelihoods. The proposed LUPs should be seen not in isolation but in connection and within the broader context of other proposed interventions, particularly alternative income generating activities that reinforce two aspects: first, reduction of human pressure on the habitat, and second, clarification of where humans can obtain livelihoods to avert the human-animal conflicts.

Comment 4: Resources have been adjusted to increase the allocation to BD-related interventions, as per recommendation.

Comment 5: As indicated in section 2 – Stakeholders; WRI, will coordinate efforts with the private sector. Preliminary identified ones are: i) Nigerien enterprises in land management and restoration - e.g. E3D, Addaxx.com, IBS Agro Industries, etc.; ii) private investors active in West Africa and interested in Niger's agricultural and forestry sectors (e.g. Injaro Agriculture Capital, Livelihood Venture, Lundin Foundation, etc.). During the PPG phase, these private sectors will be deeply engaged to confirm their primary commitment to collaboration and others will be identified. Promising the private sector, not yet consulted due to the long absence of the partner in the country is the Gum Arabic enterprise already active in the area.

Comment 6: Regarding the sustainability of output 2.2.1, the project will focus on income activities that communities have experience in but due to lack of support, they have not been able to improve to levels reduce their reliance on natural resources in ways that degrade the resources. Therefore, the logic and rationale are that the income generating activities will get initial support and communities themselves will shrewdly manage them beyond the life of the project. These activities will be identified using participatory approaches so that the proposed activities fully reflect the people's voice and the socio-economic needs and challenges at the community level.

The logic for the ‘business plans for investments’ has been explained under component 2 description. The estimates for the giraffe protected area and size of the hippo sanctuary are indicated under section 3.1 on GEBs as 69,975 ha and 1,000 ha, respectively. The 1,000 reflect the actual size of the official designation of the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary as per the government’s decree.

3. Component 3 and 4 comments: The detailed comment has been noted and appropriate adjustments have been made. The CCM amount has now been added to LD using the marginal adjustment flexibility mechanism. A new Letter of Endorsement is established by the Operational Focal Point requesting an adjustment.

Addressing comment 04-11-2019

Component 2

Comment noted with thanks – the investment type has been changed from TA to Investment as recommended. We have taken note of the comment on the software approach, however we have proposed a combined approach that considers both the software and hardware interventions in the management of both the Giraffe PA and the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary in last part of 2.1.2 ‘Institutional and technical capacity, enabling policies (e.g. communal development plans which integrate LDN and Biodiversity conservation) and infrastructure are established to manage the Giraffe Protected Area and the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary.’ The establishment of the required infrastructure to support the management of the PA and the Sanctuary will constitute interventions to address concrete needs on the ground to support and improve the management of the two areas.

We also note with thanks the comment regarding the cost of rehabilitating 34,987 ha - the proposed budget of \$1.2 million of GEF resources is based on the national standard cost for rehabilitating 1 ha of degraded land (\$340). This means that every \$1 of GEF resources will be leveraged with \$9.9 in co-financing (given that the total cost of rehabilitating 34,987 ha is ~\$11.9 million). The national standard cost of \$340 per ha to rehabilitate land includes: i) labor cost for land preparation either by creating Half Moons or establishing rocky mechanical barriers to control run-off (Cordon Pierreux) or depending on the nature of terrain the use of machinery to break the compacted land area to facilitate water infiltration; ii) purchase of seeds and establishment of nurseries or buying seedlings from private producer. The species to be used will be indigenous plant species or those adapted to the local environment (Gum Arabic trees) and generate income to local population; iii) transportation to the planting site; Planting exercise often conducted by women; iv) erection of seedling protection infrastructure which can be either iron fence or trees pruning residues; v) surveillance cost at least for the first year of establishment depending on the condition of the planted site (e.g. easy access to wondering domestic animals) and site cleaning for the first and second year of trees establishment. It is worth to note that due to the aridity condition of the country, the cost of land rehabilitation and restoration is high.

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

- Component 2, please explain clarify the sources of co-financing for this component in the amount of \$56,8 million, considering that for the delivery of the proposed interventions, Investment Mobilized (i.e. cash) will be needed.
- Component 3: There is a significant cofinancing for the component 3 (\$68.8 million). Please, explain the activities financed by this cofinancing and the justification/need for \$2.4 million from the GEF (ratio 28:1).

11-4-19

The GEF Secretariat expects \$97 million of co-financing to remain in "Investment Mobilized, which is 70% of the suggested co-financing (\$97 million of \$137.5 million). Please confirm

November 5, 2019

Addressed at PIF level. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Comments have been noted with thanks. Following recommendations on CCM, appropriate adjustments have been made to reflect the changes. The elevated cofinances dedicated to components 2 and 3 are coming from grants (IFAD, West African Development Bank and WRI). Components 2 and 3 have hardware

interventions (such as solar and irrigation systems, storage market facilities, alternative income activities, eco-tourism infrastructure) that will require more financial investments compared to components 1 and 4 (that are more focused on enabling policy environments, management plans, capacity building).

Addressing Comment 04-11-19

Comment noted with thanks, and it is hereby confirmed that \$97 million will remain in the ‘investment mobilised’ category. The indicated investments are already been transformed to commitment/agreements between the Government of Niger and these identified financing partners. Therefore, these investments are going to happen in the project area even in absence of GEF funding.

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

The resources are available.

The incremental role and the GEBs provided under the GEF7 CCM strategy are not demonstrated. The activities are largely not eligible under the current GEF7 CCM strategy for projects out of Impact Programs.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

In response to the comments on CCM activities in this project, appropriate adjustments have been made using a marginal adjustment flexibility mechanism to use the CCM amount on Land Degradation/SLM activities. Revised LoE attached.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed. See comment above for CCM.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed. See comment above for CCM.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

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

There is a request for a 181,279 PPG (+fees), within the allowable cap for a \$5.2 million project.

We suggest to remove the CCM resources.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

The CCM amount is now added to Land Degradation Focal Area using the marginal adjustment flexibility mechanism..

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- There is no indication at core indicator level of the total emission reductions expected for the project.

11-4-19

Under Indicator 1, please add the names of the 2 target protected areas, specifying the area (ha) of each one.

November 5, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

As the CCM is no longer a target in this project, the GHG Emission reduction is no longer applicable.

Addressing comment on 04-11-19

Comment noted with thanks, and addressed - Giraffe PA (69,975 ha); and Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary (1,000 ha)

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

Yes

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Yes for BD and LD.

- No for CCM.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Some sustainability aspects should be improved: protection status of the future protected areas, institutional framework for the different plans, continuity of operations after the project.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks, and addressed in the revised proposal

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

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Yes, a preliminary georeferenced map has been included in the annex of the PIF

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

- There is a long list of different stakeholders: from Ministries to private sector operators and CSO/NGO for tourism, agriculture and forest sectors: we do not know those who will be involved in the project implementation. We understand a cautious approach to consider a long list of potential stakeholders. However, this long list of partners may create wrong expectations. Please, provide a restricted list of potential partners who will be empowered for project implementation.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

The long list is cautious but more important than is that the list also reflects the level of diversity of stakeholders and potential partners in the country. A refined list with more clarified roles will be provided at PPG stage after (additional) engagement with stakeholders. We think that at the post-PPG stage, with more clarified roles and further engagement with stakeholders, there will be no risk of creating wrong expectations.

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

The gender context and information is present. However, we suggest to better mainstream gender issues, and especially inequalities in the result framework.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks, and addressed as suggested in the results framework

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. See the comment above on the engagement of stakeholders.

November 4, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes. Please, during PPG, develop this risk analysis and formulate assumptions, hypothesis and mitigation measures, if needed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks

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

Yes, we appreciate the potential collaboration with other GEF projects on similar themes (SLM, BD).

November 4, 2019

We take note of the proposed implementation arrangements which should be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

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

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks

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

Yes.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks

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

Yes.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks

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

A letter of endorsement is available, signed by the GEF OFP. Please, check that the letter is well logged into the portal.

November 4, 2019

A revised letter of endorsement is available, highlighting the application of the marginal adjustment of \$500,000 from CCM to LD.

Addressed.

Agency Response

31-10-19

Noted with thanks

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

NA

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

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

November 4, 2019

No. Please address outstanding issue listed under Part I (1, 2 and 3) and Core Indicators (6).

November 6, 2019

The PIF is recommended for clearance and work program inclusion.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Confirm co-financing, including the ratio of Investment Mobilized to Recurrent Expenditure.
- Confirm the core indicators, including the areas of the 2 target protected areas and restoration area.

- Provide a comprehensive risks analysis.
- Share the studies on gender, and mainstream gender issues into the result framework.
- Confirm the implementation arrangements.

Review Dates

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval