

FOLUR Global Knowledge to Action Platform to Support Transformational Shifts In Food and Land Use Systems

Basic Information

GEF ID

10306

Countries

Global

Project Title

FOLUR Global Knowledge to Action Platform to Support Transformational Shifts In Food and Land Use Systems

GEF Agency(ies)

World Bank

Agency ID

World Bank: P171191

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Paul Hartman

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I – Project Informatic

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

06/17/20

Yes, the project remains aligned with focal area elements

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted. Thank you.

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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- Additional outcomes and indicators are required that capture the transformation value of the Platform and how the project is demonstrating that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.
- Many of the outputs are written as indicators. Please adjust as appropriate.
- The PMC of 5.2% of the project budget is higher than the maximum recommended of 5%. In addition, the contribution to the PMC from co-financing is less with 2.5%. Please justify these numbers or adjust accordingly.

6/28/20

Additional outcomes and indicators that capture the transformation value of this Platform have been provided. The PMC has been revised and is aligned with GEF policy.

Two of the Outputs for Pillar C- KM are still written as indicators and not outputs. These are: 1) Participants in FOLUR facilitated KM events, annual meeting, South- South exchanges, GLF, etc.(Including female); and 2) Members of FOLUR supported Communities of Practice (Including female). Please reformulate the outputs accordingly.

7/17/20

Outputs have been revised in pillar C on Knowledge Management

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

The two outputs referenced have been revised in the workplan output tracking tool (Annex 3) and the GEF data sheet (Table B).

June 17, 2020 :

The entire Results Framework has been revised to take account of these comments. Additional outcomes and indicators that capture the transformation value of this platform and how it will demonstrate that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts have now been included (Annex 3).

The budget has been adjusted to accurately reflect the PMC and the additional cofinancing, which is now documented in letters uploaded in the Portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

No. Co-financing as indicated is an estimation. Please provide supporting evidence of co-financing. In addition, in Table C the name of co-financier should be the World Bank without the name of a program. Also, the type of co-financing should be indicated. Please correct.

6/28/20

Letters of co-financing support have been provided but they don't specify if the co-financing is in-kind or grant. Please revise. In Table C the name of the co-financier is now correct.

7/17/20

Co-financing letters have been revised.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Revised letters of cofinancing support have now been provided specifying the nature of the cofinancing, and also further confirmed with the PPO. For future reference, it may be pointed out that MDTF support is always in the form of grants to projects as noted in the CEO stage GEF data sheet.

June 17, 2020 : Letters of co-financing support are included with the package in the GEF portal. Budget information presented in the Project Document has been updated with appropriate references.

Co-Financing will be in the form of project financing, TA and Analytics under the World Bank managed PROGREEN Umbrella Trust Fund (the Global Partnership for Sustainable and Resilient Landscapes, (P167013) and the analytical projects: Environmental Impacts of Agricultural Support: Aligning Food Security and Climate Protection Objectives and Realigning Agricultural Policies and Support for Sustainable Food Systems. Letters of Co-financing support have been uploaded in the portal.

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

06/17/20

No. The budget detail provided is very high level and not what we would expect at CEO Endorsement. Please provide a more detailed budget, if available.

6/28/20

Thank you for the detailed budget provided. Nevertheless, the budget still lacks the details by expenditure categories i.e. by goods (equipment), works (if any), consultancy, staff cost, travel, training/meeting/workshop, sub-contract, operating costs, etc. Please provide a detailed budget including such items. The Agency might consider using the suggested budget template that is currently being included in

the revised Guidelines on the Project Cycle Policy and under discussion with all Agencies.

7/17/20

Sufficient budget detail is provided in Annex 5, Table 3.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : While it is noted that the revised guidelines are not yet approved and effective, budget presentations were updated to include an allocation of estimated budget across expenditure categories as found relevant (Annex 5, Table 3). Given the nature of this coordination project which is structured as a Bank -Executed TF implemented by the Bank with several core partners, proposed budget have some flexibility built in for adaptive management and, any needed adjustments during project implementation.

June 17, 2020 : A more detailed budget has now been provided including additional activity on sub-activity by year.

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

06/17/20

Yes, the status and utilization are reported.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- For Core Indicator 1, it is not clear how this indicator will be attained through project activities. Please clarify in the narrative. If the indicator is relevant, the Protected areas should be identified (name, WDPA ID, IUCN category).
- Core indicator 6: the climate mitigation is reported to be 10,000 tCO₂ instead of 10,00,000 tCO₂.
- In the Core indicator worksheet, please include expected results at PIF/Concept stage within the sub-indicators, not just at CEO endorsement period, or make sure there is consistency between the two.

6/28/20

Please ensure that the information on how indicator 1 is attained is reflected in the project description. In addition, please clarify if the results fall into Core Indicator 1.1 (new PA), as is indicated in the Portal CEO ER, or CI 1.2 (improved management of existing PAs), as indicated in the uploaded CI worksheet, and ensure consistency between the two. If the indicator does fall into 1.2, PAs would still be need to be identified (name, WDPA ID, IUCN category).

Core indicator 6 has been corrected.

The results for Indicator 4 are not consistent in the portal and project documents. The portal indicates 250,000 ha, while the project documents have 2,500,000 ha. Please ensure consistency between all documents.

7/17/20

As core indicator 1 is focused on PA management and thus not a key indicator for the FOLUR program, the removal of this estimate is acceptable. Please do track results for this indicator, if any, during implementation.

The target results for indicator 4 have been made consistent across the portal and ProDoc.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 :

- Thank you for the comment. The Core Indicator 1 attribution was revisited, reconsidered and has been removed. The contribution of the global platform through its cofinancing leverage (support to investment projects) will be tracked during implementation to instead account for support to the areas of landscapes managed.

- Noted. Thank you.

- The target numbers are now consistent. In particular, a typing error in the GEF portal entry has been corrected. In revisiting the core indicator 1 attribution, revisions were made, and the core indicator 4 target has subsequently been upwardly adjusted to 3,000,000 ha. This better reflects the impacts from the potential investments that are expected to be leveraged during the project implementation period.

June 17, 2020 : Projects financed through the mentioned FOLUR cofinancing support are expected to leverage the hectares referenced in the core indicator table. This was done in line with the GEFSEC recommendation at the PFD stage to show the additional leverage of the coordination grant.

Core Indicator 6 has been corrected.

Core Indicator worksheet has been updated for consistency.

art 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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- Challenges, root causes and barriers strengthen the description. Nevertheless, further clarification should be provided specifically to the challenges at the global level in order to justify the need of such a Global Platform and to legitimize the proposed activities.

- In addition to the global aspect, please see additional comments from Council members on analysis that would be useful in terms of climate change, resilience, and ag systems.

6/17/20

6/28/20

Thank you for the significant improvements. There is now sufficient elaboration of root causes and barriers and how they are going to be addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Noted. Thank you.

June 17, 2020 :

Further clarification has now been provided specifically on the challenges at the global level in order to justify a platform at the global level and legitimize the proposed activities (Section A, Subsections II-IV).

Council members' comments have been addressed (Section A) and with further development of the activities related to climate change, resilience and ag systems in the project description of Pillar B (Para 52).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

No. The list of the existing commodity coalitions in Annex 7 is informative, but it is also important to understand in the baseline section what already exists at global level that the project can/will build on (eg. FAO, FOLU, GGP, GLF WB portfolio, Progreen, etc).

6/28/20

The section has been improved. Please also include the GLF to the description, as it is a core partner.

7/17/20

A description of the Global Landscape Forum, which is a core partner of the program, has now been included in baseline.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : The baseline scenario description now includes mention of GLF.

June 17, 2020: Additional explanation and background now confirm the baseline and what already exists at the global level that the platform will build on (Section A, new Subsection IV on Baseline Scenario).

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

06/17/20

No. Elements of the approach that should be reflected more strongly in the proposal include:

- The importance of knowledge resources and tools for Comprehensive Land Use Planning and other policy options. These are currently found under FOLU Coalition and need to be brought upfront to emphasize their potential relevance for countries. The Action Tracker should also be considered in a similar respect.
- How global engagement with private sector companies will translate to implementation of better practice in the country projects.
- While the Pillar B is the most important in terms of investments, its description under the Alternative scenario is very short. The activities should be further developed
- How Knowledge Management tools and communications outputs will feed directly into policy processes within the country projects.

6/28/20

Comments have been adequately addressed. The proposed alternative scenario is sound.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Noted. Thank you.

July 9, 2020 : Noted. Thank you.

June 17, 2020:

- Additional explanation and background on the FOLU Coalition and land use planning expertise have now been addressed in Section A, new Subsection IV on Baseline Scenario. Additional information has been added to Section A which strengthens the rationale for the Global Platform and the activities designed to deliver the skills of experienced partners in a manner that is relevant to the CPs.
- Section E, Subsection I, has been strengthened with information on private sector engagement and specific activities that the platform will undertake with global and regional private sector coalitions and roundtables to support and advance the implementation of better practices in collaboration with country projects.
- The document has been strengthened with a more detailed description on the key focal areas and the activities that will be undertaken in pursuit of the three components of Pillar B (Section B, Subsection III).
- Detail on how the Knowledge Management tools and communications outputs of the Global Platform will support policy process engagement at the country-level is now provided (Section B, Subsection III).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

Yes, further elaboration has been provided on how the project is aligned with the impact program

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

Yes, the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing are all clearly elaborated.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

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

06/17/20

Yes, the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits is clearly elaborated.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

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

06/17/20

No. The sustainability of program results is described generically in one paragraph. Please elaborate on the elements that will make this project sustainable, many of which have been presented elsewhere in the narrative.

06/17/20

6/28/20

The comment is addressed; however, it appears that paragraph on scaling up has been deleted from section B.VI. Please check that this hasn't been done in error and revise.

7/17/20

The section on Scaling has been added back into the ProDoc.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020: Thank you for noting this deletion, which was made in error during the revision process. The language on scaling up has been added back (Paragraph 88).

June 17, 2020: Elements that will make the results of this project sustainable have now been more thoroughly elaborated (Section B, Subsection VI, Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling Up).

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

06/28/20

Project map has been included.

Cleared

Agency Response July 8, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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

06/17/20

Yes, there is adequate reflection of how the child project will contribute to overall program impact.

Project map has been included.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- While a separate stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) is included as per GEF Guidelines, a section on stakeholder engagement is required that details how stakeholder engagement will be operationalized. Some of this information is stated throughout the document. Some

elements from the GEF SEP checklist include:

- The stakeholders, their relevant interests, and why they are included
- The steps and actions to achieve meaningful consultation and inclusive participation, including information dissemination
- Roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan
- The timing of the engagement throughout the project cycle
- The budget for stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle
- Key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation, and steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise

- Please describe the consultations that took place with key stakeholders during the project preparation (this is a requirement of GEF's Policy on Stakeholder Engagement effective on July 1, 2018).

6/28/20

The SEP has been elaborated. Description of the consultations that took place with key stakeholders during the project preparation has been included.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Noted. Thank you.

June 17, 2020 : The FOLUR Global Platform stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) has now been more fully elaborated, including details on how stakeholder engagement will be operationalized (Annex H of the GEF data sheet and Annex 10 of the project document). This addresses the elements of the GEF SEP checklist.

The consultation process with key stakeholders during project preparation has been summarized in the SEP attached to the submission and in the GEF data sheet.

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

06/17/20

No.

- The information contained in the Annex on Gender is very good, but the context section does not provide enough information on issues related to Gender.

- Please provide a yes or no response to the question heading "Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women"

6/28/20

The comments on gender have been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Noted. Thank you

June 17, 2020 : The context section has been updated and improved to reference issues related to Gender (Section A, Subsection I, Para 5). The project description activities have been strengthened with respect to Gender issues.

The datasheet has been updated accordingly to mark Yes- as the gender gap will be addressed.

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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- As a means of more clearly demonstrating 'docking' with countries, the agency should provide a clear understanding of the way forward in engaging additional platforms and initiatives that are already mobilizing countries and private sector and will support the outcomes of the FOLUR IP. How will the organizational framework ensure that entities such as CFI (for Cocoa) and SRP (for Rice) etc are involved in platform activities?

- The description of the demand side of the value chain focuses on consumers driving sustainable consumption of global commodities. Yet, due to reputational risk many brands are eager to demonstrate their good practice, whether it is directly rewarded by the end user or not. An additional focus on how this will be factored would be clarifying.

6/28/20

The comment on docking has been addressed. A response to the question on reputational risk as a driver of good practice doesn't appear in the section on Private Sector Engagement. Please address.

7/17/20

The response provided in the ProDoc on reputational risk is adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020: The Private Sector Engagement section now includes information on reputational risk as a driver of good practices and engagement with the FOLUR Global Platform (Paragraphs 129-131, Project Document). In summary, the collaboration with the FOLUR Global Platform provide positive pathways for managing and mitigating companies' risks, including adopting and applying standards, practices and technologies – developed collaboratively with like-minded corporate and NGO partners.

June 17, 2020: The discussion of engagement with the private sector and the commodity platforms has been updated and further detailed in Section E.I. including a discussion of specific activities that can be conducted with private entities and roundtables in a manner that supports CPs in advancing the goals and outcomes of the FOLUR IP. Specific global and regional coalitions and roundtables and entry points are included in Tables 4 and 5 and in Annex 7.

Reputational risk as a driver of corporate sustainability commitments is acknowledged and further elaborated in the private sector

implementation as a driver of corporate sustainability commitments is being engaged and further elaborated in the private sector engagement strategy.

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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- There is no mention of climate change or other environmental risks.
- In addition, the overall project risk rating is missing and we don't see clearly specific information on environmental and social safeguards risks as required in the GEF policy GEF/C.57/Inf.05 from Dec 12, 2019. The agency should provide information on the screening that they undertake according their own internal rules.

6/28/20

Climate change has been included as an environmental risk. The ESS information as per new GEF policy from Dec 2019 is still missing. However, the agency has uploaded a "Note on Environmental and Social Framework."

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Noted. Thank you.

June 17, 2020 : The risk table and ESF section have been updated and improved to address this comment (Section D, Risk Management and Section C.VI for ESF compliance).

It should also be clarified that as a Programmatic, World Bank-Executed ASA, the Global Platform is not expected to prepare and disclose

separate ESF documents that would be usually part of a regular Investment Project Lending operations. Please refer to the Global Platform ESF note provided in the submission, to confirm the compliance and rules applicable to the Global Platform.

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

06/17/20

No. Please address the following:

- The terms of reference for the steering committee should lay out the decision-making process including the roles and responsibilities of the core partners. How will new partners and entities be engaged in planning and review of program activities to guide allocation of resources for implementation?
- While the Food Systems Summit (FSS) is mentioned in the proposal as a specific mandate for FAO, it is unclear what role the WB will be in this event. Considering the alignment of the FSS and the FOLUR IP and the fact that WB is gearing up for Food Systems 2030 program, a strong strategic engagement with FSS will help to raise the profile and awareness of the program.
- Please add verbiage on how the Platform could evaluate the possibility of liaison with relevant stand-alone GEF-7 projects that are not part of FOLUR but deal with sustainable food production in order to increase impacts.

6/28/20

The process for how investment decisions will be made isn't sufficiently clarified. Please provide further detail on what is envisioned. Other comments have been addressed.

7/17/20

The process related to Steering Committee decision-making vis-a-vis future investments has been clarified. The institutional arrangement for project implementation is well described

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020: Thank you. The process of Steering Committee decision making by consensus has been further elaborated in Paragraph 89 and the subsequent bullet points, in the Project document.

June 17, 2020 :

The TORs for the Steering Committee now layout the decision-making process including the roles and responsibilities of the Core Partners and how new partners and entities will be engaged in planning and review of program activities to guide allocation of resources for implementation (Section C, Subsection I).

The Global Platform will have a clear role in the Food Systems Summit, which is now described in the text (Section B, Subsection IV, Table 3).

The Global Platform will engage with relevant standalone GEF-7 projects and other partners engaged in the FOLUR space as further described in Section B, Subsection V, paragraph 80 describing opportunities for collaboration.

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

06/17/20

Yes. The project document adequately describes alignment with national strategies, plans, reports and assessments under relevant conventions.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

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

06/17/20

No. Please explain in a separate section the knowledge management approach, including the identification of key deliverables and associated timeline, along with an explanation of how it will contribute to the project’s overall impact.

6/28/20

The timeline of deliverables is missing as it is unclear what “ongoing” means for future activities. Please address.

7/17/20

Changes reflected in table 2 under Pillar C are adequate. The proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project is adequately elaborated.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020: The deliverables timeline has been updated to provide a more concrete calendar (Table 2 under Pillar C description, Project document).

June 17, 2020: A new section on Knowledge Management approach is included together with a table showing the key deliverables and associated timeline (Section B, Subsection III and Table 2).

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

06/17/20

No. A clear M&E Plan hasn't been included. The Results Framework is missing baseline, targets, and indicators for the outcomes. For a program this size there needs to be a comprehensive M&E Plan and Results Framework.

6/28/20

The results framework has been significantly improved; however the budgeted M&E plan is still missing.

7/17/20

The M&E plan is budgeted under Pillar D and it monitors and measures results.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020: The M&E plan is provided under Section C, Part III, as part of the institutional arrangements (Paragraph 91). This section has been slightly refined to clearly indicate and highlight the activities under the M&E Plan, including its monitoring arrangements and reporting needs (focusing on the Core Indicators, monitoring and reporting on the Results Framework, and managing the work planning tool). The M&E plan is budgeted under Pillar D: Program Management, Coordination and Monitoring and details are available in Annex 5, including the proposed annual allocations.

June 17, 2020: The M&E plan has now been further developed to indicate how the Results Framework indicators will be monitored and measured (Section C, Subsection III, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting). The Results Framework has been more fully developed to include baseline, targets, definitions, responsibilities and indicators for the outcomes (Annex 3).

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

06/17/20

No. We note that RIO Marker 1 has been selected for Climate Change Adaptation. It is not clear where additional and adaptation benefits have been highlighted. The same applies for socio-economic benefits. It may be best to include these in Annex 1.

6/28/20

Socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project have been sufficiently described.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020: Noted. Thank you

June 17, 2020: As recommended the adaptation and socio-economic benefits related to the Global Project are elaborated as described in Annex 1.

As noted at the time of PFD development the adaptation benefits, even if indirect, are crosscutting and inherently linked to the goals of the FOLUR IP. The CPs including the global coordination grant, are designed to include a set of activities aimed at facilitating the adaptation, uptake and scaling up of sustainable production of the selected commodities. Similarly, while the socio-economic benefits are more visible at the level of the CP interventions, they should be viewed in the context of platform facilitated actions that help enhance the impact of the CPs nationally.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020 : Noted Thank you.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

No. Comments not adequately addressed include:

- Norwegian-Danish constituency- Adaptation in particular from a higher more strategic level and the Results Framework.
- Germany- Reference to LDN.

Please address.

6/28/20

Thank you for providing detailed responses to all of the council comments. While the responses are generally sufficient, we would like to see some of the them better reflected directly in the project description. Specifically:

- 1) Germany -- The response to Germany’s questions on adaptation benefits and climate change impacts--which also relates to a STAP comment--should be explicit in the project description.
- 2) Switzerland -- a) Switzerland’s request to reiterate the Theory of Change in the project description is sensible. The response the agency has provided in the review sheet is reasonable, but we suggest that you consider inclusion of the TOC diagram in the project description and not only the annex. b) Related to Switzerland’s’ question on addressing trade-offs between sustainable land management and sustainable supply chains, please make reference to the World Resources Report and World Bank findings, and provide further details the additional flagship studies that are planned in the project description .

7/17/20

Council comments have been adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : Please see revised and clarified references in the previous version of the Project Document in response to Council comments.

- 1) While there is appears to be no direct reference by Germany on adaptation benefits and climate change impacts, perhaps the reviewer is referring to comments made by the Norwegian-Danish constituency. The adaptation benefits are included in Annex 1. The references to addressing climate change have been strengthened in paragraphs 51 to 53, emphasizing the analytical work and knowledge products that the Platform can provide to assist CPs in efforts to plan and invest strategically to manage climate change risk.

2)a The IP Level TOC is now included in Annex 2 and the main text of the Project Document (following Paragraph 18). It is however important to emphasize that the ToC for the Global Platform child project is separate and developed specifically (Figure 3, Page 15) to show how the underlying challenges will be addressed through the planned interventions.

2)b. The Project Document now more explicitly addresses Switzerland's question, "Can you explain how you will address the potential challenges and trade-offs between truly integrated sustainable land management and the creation of efficient sustainable supply chains, i.e. efficient production patterns?" Please reference Paragraphs 51-53 for findings from World Resources Report and the World Bank research.

The following context is noted in the Council response matrix: The FOLUR IP is built on the evidence and conviction that integrated and sustainable land management and commodity production methods are an urgent global priority. The 'World Resources Report: Creating a Sustainable Food Future' shows how it is possible to feed the world without destroying the planet and offers a menu of solutions www.WRI.org/sustfoodfuture. The World Bank has recently estimated that the market value of the global food system is about \$10 trillion, while the 'hidden costs' of the food and land use system due to under nutrition, pollution, GHGs, loss and waste is more than \$12 trillion. This indicates that most current production practices are not efficient or cost effective when all externalities are calculated. These issues are explored in the World Bank's "Future of Food" series of publications (<https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/24104>) and summarized at <https://blogs.worldbank.org/voices/do-costs-global-food-system-outweigh-its-monetary-value>

The Global Platform will sponsor additional flagship studies to deepen the documentation and understanding of these issues, for example including climate risk and adaptation assessments as summarized in paragraphs 51 to 53.

Flagship report topics will be chosen based on strategic discussions among Core Partners and outlined in Annual Work Plans considered by the SC. These are expected to focus on strategic issues in support of regional and global level dialogue processes, including the Food Systems Summit and the annual UNFCCC COPs. Flagships will continue and update the products mentioned above focusing on climate impacts on food systems, opportunities to improve policy harmonization toward sustainability and strategies for mobilizing public & private sector financing for sustainable supply chains and production systems.

June 17, 2020 : The Council comments have been updated and attached to the submission.

The Norwegian-Danish constituency (June 2019) commented: The program includes commodities as well as food crops – challenges may be similar in some ways but are not always identical. Both agriculture itself and surrounding lands contain genetic resources for food and agriculture, a vital resource for resilient food production in coming years. It is therefore timely to focus on Food Systems and their effect on the environment.

The FOLUR Global Platform document recognizes the challenges and the World Bank agrees that it is timely to focus on these issues. Recognizing this importance and timeliness, the World Bank, with FOLUR Partners, organized an event at the recent Global Landscapes Forum Digital Conference on "Food in the time of crises." The session on June 5, 2020 focused on "Greening food systems: Accelerating the transition to environmental sustainability." <https://www.globallandscapesforum.org/> The session brought together leaders from GEF, World Bank, IFC, WRI, business and finance (Livelihoods Venture and Olam International) for a thoughtful discussion of the issues of food production and reducing its impact on the environment. The FOLUR Global Platform will continue to support and scale up this kind of convening and knowledge sharing.

The Norwegian-Danish constituency (June 2019) commented: We would like to be informed more in detail on how the program will ensure "adaptation benefits by creating more climate-resilient and disease-reliant plants" as stated on page 41 in the main document.

The FOLUR Global Platform will focus not on 'creating' but assisting countries to adopt and adapt more climate- and disease-resilient crop varieties as part of their response / adaptation to climate change effects on suitability of specific lands for specific crop types. This will be

done through assessments, training, technical assistance and policy advice. More detail on the proposed climate assessments is included in the response to STAP comments below. Specifically, the project description under Pillar B (Section B.II.) has been strengthened on Platform support for analytics and evidence that help to solidify the rationale for country investments in climate resilience and sustainability.

The Norwegian-Danish constituency (June 2019) commented: We note that the issue of challenges for certain food crops due to climate change has also been brought up by the STAP in their review of this Program.

The FOLUR Global Platform description under Pillar B (Section B.II.) has been strengthened to describe efforts to develop analytics and evidence that help to solidify the technical, social and economic rationale for countries prioritizing key future investments in climate resilience and sustainability. This is detailed further in the response to STAP below. The Global Platform Partners will undertake needs assessments and support strategy development in collaboration with CPs, commodity sector actors, research organizations, and other GEF and other development partners. This work will build on existing World Bank Knowledge Products, including Climate Risk Country Profiles; Climate Smart Agriculture Country Profiles, and Climate Smart Agriculture Investment Plans which can advise countries on how adapt to and mitigate climate change.

Germany (June 2019) commented that the PFD “systematically narrows landscape ecosystem challenges down to forest resources” and does not address “soils and targeted incentives for sustainable soil management” and suggested to (i) address “the vital role of soil ecosystem services,” include reference to GSP/FAO; (ii) include “reference to Land Degradation Neutrality (SDG 15.3) targets and policies,” and (iii) include reference to UNCCD, the Economics of Land Degradation Initiative, and the Economics of Ecosystem Restoration by FAO.

The FOLUR Global Platform Project Document has been updated with additional discussion of these points on soils, LDN, SDG 15.3, and the work of UNCCD and FAO in the Baseline Scenario (Section A, Subsection IV). At the overall Program level these alignments find particular relevance in the context of the child projects which will help support the respective governments in meeting their obligations. Reference to the Land Degradation Neutrality Fund is also included in Section E.I. at paragraph 129 in the approach for Engaging with Investors and Financial Institutions.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

No. STAP comments on Climate change & KM are not adequately addressed. Please address.

06/28/20

While STAP's question about factoring future climate change impacts is primarily directed at the country project level, the platform should also play a role in facilitating these efforts. To this end, the agency's response in Pillar B and Section D are too limited. As this also relates to council comments from Germany, under the component description the agency should be more clear and explicit vis-à-vis efforts to address climate change risk.

7/17/20

STAP comments have been addressed adequately.

Cleared

Agency Response

July 8, 2020 : The references to addressing climate change have been strengthened in paragraphs 51 to 53, emphasizing the analytical work and knowledge products that the Platform can provide to assist CPs in efforts to plan and invest strategically to manage climate change risk. STAP comments are directed at the FOLUR national child projects which as relevant will need to incorporate elements of climate change impacts, assisted by the knowledge products and TA from the Platform and Core Partners (and IAs). In its role as a facilitator of knowledge, technical support and learning, the Platform will support these efforts based on demand from the countries. In addition, measures for reducing climate risk are central to the design of the project and are captured in the revised Section D (Paragraph 105).

June 17, 2020 : Please see the additional sections developed in the Project document which also address the STAP comments

STAP commented that (i) future climate change may affect adaptation and resilience by undermining food/ commodity productivity or suitability in a certain region, such that improved management, alternative crops or other solutions would be needed to ensure a robust response and consideration of these possibilities will be needed in CPs; (ii) that region and location-specific climate impact assessments and response strategies will be needed in CPs; (iii) that these assessments will need to assimilate emerging and new climate science and projections; scenario analyses; and ecological, technological and economic analysis; and (iv) that climate risks need to be better addressed.

STAP reviewer's point is well noted. These comments have been conveyed to the GEF IAs preparing CPs and, will work with them during preparation to ensure that comments are addressed in final CP submission.

In addition, the Project Document of the FOLUR Global Platform incorporates these recommendations, particularly in the project description under Pillar B (Section B.II.) and also captures the climate risk in general at the Platform level (Section D of the Project document). The

Platform includes a set of activities to develop analytics and evidence that help to solidify the technical, social and economic rationale for countries prioritizing key future investments in climate resilience and sustainability. A key need in many countries and some key crops is

better understanding of the effects of climate change on agricultural production, soil and land suitability, and the timing and cost of prospective changes on different areas and segments of society. The Global Platform Partners will undertake needs assessments and support strategy development in collaboration with CPs, commodity sector actors, research organizations, and other GEF and other development partners. This work will build on existing World Bank Knowledge Products, including Climate Risk Country Profiles; Climate Smart Agriculture Country Profiles, and Climate Smart Agriculture Investment Plans which can advise countries on how adapt to and mitigate climate change. The detailed description of budgeted activities in Annex 5 notes that with FAO as a Core partner and GEF IA, the Platform will support refinement of agro-ecological zoning assessments to track the resilience of commodity / crop production in key regional landscapes, assess likely geographic changes due to future impacts of climate change, and identify the regions / cropping systems most likely to be affected. Such climate assessments can strengthen the rationale for countries to invest, for example, in improved agromet services, research and development into more resilient seedstock, farmer training and extension on production and market opportunities for alternate crop production systems, and application of incentives or safety net programs to assist farming communities with necessary transitions.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

Status provided

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020: Noted Thank you.

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

Yes, included

Cleared

Agency Response June 17, 2020: Noted Thank you.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

EESEC DECISION

LEAD DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

06/17/20

No. Please address GEFSEC comments and resubmit.

6/28/20

No. Please address remaining comments.

7/17/20

Yes, the CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/17/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/28/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/17/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Through the “FOLUR Global Knowledge to Action Platform to Support Transformational Shifts In Food and Land Use Systems” project, (10306) the World Bank seeks \$29,128,440 in GEF financing. This project objective is to support transformational shifts in the use of environmentally sustainable practices and policies for priority global value chains. It is structured around four pillars/components: A) Program Capacity Strengthening; B) Policy and Value Chain Engagement; C) Strategic Knowledge Management (KM) and Communications; and D) Program Oversight, Coordination and M&E. The Global Platform, working with 27 Country Projects, offers capacity building, technical assistance, policy engagement, resource mobilization, and knowledge exchange that help to address the defined needs for: more concerted collective action, more coordinated and integrated interventions; scaled up investment with a faster pace and greater impact; the need for policy harmonization and subsidy repurposing, financial innovation and leverage, and knowledge exchange, communication and outreach to existing and new stakeholders.

CONTEXT, BASELINE, INCREMENTAL REASONING: Ongoing agricultural expansion – driven by growing demand for food, and coupled with poor productivity, policies and practices – contributes to 80 percent of global deforestation and 70 percent of freshwater withdrawals, drives landscape degradation and biodiversity loss, and contributes almost 30 percent of global Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. With the world population rising to nine billion by 2050, and incomes expected to rise, food consumption is projected to double, potentially accelerating these negative outcomes. The current agrifood system is simply not sustainable.

Under the baseline scenario, multiple global stakeholders and institutions have recognized the importance of working on challenges emanating from food systems: governments, large companies, and international organizations as well as local producers, smallholders, research organizations, consumer advocacy groups and environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). The World Bank Group and the Global Environment Facility have initiated and financed activities to solidify analytics, test models, refine practices, build partnerships, strengthen collaborations and solidify the international consensus on the way forward. Many countries have already embarked upon policy and institutional reforms, often in the context of international commitments, to promote community-based rural development, and to enhance the engagement of stakeholders across sectors, as well as development partners, scientific institutions and the private sector

Despite this, new ways of working across sectors at the landscape level are needed to meet future food demand sustainably and ensure a resilient food system. Expected growth in production will have to be managed through sustainable intensification – as well as improved enabling policies and governance that support scaling of good practices. New approaches should aim to minimize negative environmental impacts, sustain natural capital, and meet the increased and diversified food demand without risk of further habitat loss. Restoration of degraded land and soil offers vast potential as a carbon sink and as a means to make more land available for agriculture without further impacting natural habitats and the ecosystem services that they generate. Despite alarming degradation trends, there are clear opportunities for improving the sustainability of commodity production and consumption that can lead to reduced pressure on landscapes and ecosystems.

Through the GEF increment, the Global Platform will support the FOLUR IP to achieve more integrated, collaborative approaches and better aligned policies and incentives. It will ensure the global engagement of the private sector, including agribusiness, food processing industry, and the financial sector, to scale up improved practices and quality standards across global value chains. The Global Platform's structure, partnerships, and activities will add value and impact to the FOLUR IP by mobilizing finance, elevating policy dialogue, and convening key decision-makers at the global scale. Finally, the Global Platform will act at global and regional levels, bringing parties together, nurturing regional and multi-country partnerships, analyzing issues and developing evidence for improved practices to help the FOLUR countries achieve more than could working in isolation. - going beyond what the country projects can do by themselves.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT BENEFITS: GEBs resulting from the project include 200,000ha of land restored, 3,000,000ha of landscapes under improved practices, and 10 million metric tons of CO₂e mitigated, with co-benefits to 50,000 direct beneficiaries.