



Northern Mozambique Rural Resilience Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11133

Countries

Mozambique

Project Name

Northern Mozambique Rural Resilience Project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

6/27/2024

Review completed by PM

8/20/2024

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Not fully.

Please add a short paragraph explaining that this project is part of the Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program (ERIP) and the specific contribution of this child project to the program. (This is mentioned in the alignment section, but should be included here upfront as well).

08/20/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Please find the updated project summary, including a narrative on the ERIP and the child project program.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

(Please note that the Program Manager served as a peer reviewer of the project during the design stage. Comments made during the peer review have been addressed and are adequately reflected in the CEO endorsement request. The peer review is uploaded in the documents section for official use).

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Not fully.

On gender: As per GEF Guidance, gender considerations should be mainstreamed throughout the project, and the Gender Action Plan should be uploaded for us to review. In this regard, please ensure that:

- i) Gender Action Plan is uploaded.
- ii) Policies and frameworks developed are gender-responsive, addressing specific challenges.
- iii) Women, women's organizations, and gender experts are included in decision-making processes and capacity training in sustainable ecosystem restoration.
- iv) Knowledge management captures and disseminates good practices and lessons learned from a gender perspective.
- v) Under M&E, ensure that gender dimensions are reported and monitored on, and that the Gender Action Plan is budgeted.

08/20/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

- i) Gender Action Plan is uploaded for your review.
 - ii) Enhanced as per suggested, see updated child project description under Gender section.
 - iii) Enhanced as per suggested, see updated child project description under Gender section.
 - iv) Enhanced as per suggested, see updated child project description under Gender section.
 - v) M&E includes gender and age disaggregation, see updated child project description under Stakeholder Engagement.
- 5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**
- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
 - b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Not fully.

Core indicator 6:

- please provide referenced EX-ACT tool to check the assumptions and figures provided in the table.

- please use the standard 20 years duration of accounting instead of 5 years.

08/20/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you, please refer to updated GHG emissions and duration, as well as EX-ACT calculation below.

GHG analysis also uploaded in the roadmap.

Summary GHG analysis

Continent	Eastern Africa
Country	Mozambique
Climate	Tropical
Moisture	Dry

Total area (ha)	101,000
-----------------	---------

Project duration (in years)

Implementation Phase	5
Capitalization Phase	15
Total Duration of Accounting	20

MITIGATION POTENTIAL

-8,268,740

tCO₂-e

Results presented here include GHG fluxes on mineral and organic soils

See further down for detailed results on organic soils

GROSS FLUXES

In tCO2-e over the whole period analysis

PROJECT COMPONENTS		WITHOUT	WITH	BALANCE
Land use changes	Deforestation	0	0	0
	Afforestation	0	-5,054,615	-5,054,615
	Other land-use	0	0	0
Cropland	Annual	11,954	1,494	-10,460
	Perennial	0	0	0
	Flooded rice	0	0	0
Grasslands & Livestock	Grasslands	0	0	0
	Livestock	0	0	0
	Forest mngt.	48,870	-3,154,796	-3,203,666
	Inland wetlands	0	0	0
	Coastal wetlands	0	0	0
	Fisheries and aquaculture	0	0	0
	Inputs & Invest.	0	0	0
Total emissions, tCO2-e		60,824	-8,207,916	-8,268,740
Total emissions, tCO2-e/ha		0.6	-81.3	-81.9
Total emissions, tCO2-e/ha/yr		0.0	-4.1	-4.1

+ = Source / - = Sink

Results presented here include GHG fluxes on mineral and organic soils

See further down for detailed results on organic soils

* Includes fisheries, aquaculture and inputs & investments that are not included in the AFOLU definition.

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Not fully.

Please adjust the rating under the 'Environmental and Social' risk category in line with the ESS risk category. The ratings are not in line as is. Doing so would be in line with the description of the 'Environmental and Social' risk category in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite document (GEF/C.66/13) stating that: 'The rating reported by project under this category is identical to the Overall Safeguards Risk rating provided at PIF, CEO Endorsement, MTR and TE stage.'

08/20/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Risks were updated to "High" for "Environment and Social risk". Thank you for catching these discrepancies.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
07/09/2024: No.

Please upload.

08/20/2024: Uploaded.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you, Please find uploaded Gender Action Plan.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: PPG was not utilized

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Not fully.

Please submit letter of co-financing support for amount of \$150,000,000. It is currently not available in the portal.

08/20/2024: Not fully. The co-financing letter has been uploaded. However, there is an issue that still needs to be addressed: the co-financing letter from IDA indicates an amount of USD 37.2 million, whereas the portal entry is USD 150 million. Please clarify / adjust these figures for consistency. Additionally, the term "credit" used in the letter typically refers to a concessional loan, not a grant. The portal currently lists this as a grant instead of a loan. Please adjust as necessary.

08/29/2024: New co-financing letter has been uploaded.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

Please find uploaded co-financing letter.

Responses to 8/20/2024

Thank you. The letter has been revised and the category in the portal entry has been changed to "loan"

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs were provided: Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

e) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e) [If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: The World Bank's logframe is autogenerated by the Bank's portal. The reviewer finds it adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? (Note: the provision of maps is at the discretion of agencies considering sensitivities in the given context)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response Thank you.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Please refer to comments made above on key risks.

08/20/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The comment on "Environmental and Social" risk has addressed above.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Comments on the budget:

- Please provide a brief justification for the purchase of motorized vehicles (motorbikes) through the GEF grant for the Program Manager's consideration.

- Please clarify which line items will enable the project/project staff and participants to participate/contribute to global/regional activities under the Ecosystem restoration Program and its Communities of Practice.

08/20/2024: Addressed.

Program Manager approves purchase of motorbikes, the justification provided is considered adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response

Thank you.

- Motorbikes are use as traditional way of transportation in the field in Mozambique in forest management and patrolling operations. Motorbikes will be procured to strengthen the technical capacity of the Forest Reserves.

- Under Trainings, Workshops, Meetings / Community business development 648K and Workshops 350k.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

ANNEX I: Responses to Project Reviews

8.11 a) Have responses to Council comments, if any, at PIF/PCN stage been provided?

b) Have responses to STAP screen, if any, been provided?

c) Have responses to other comments, if any, been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency ResponseThank you.

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval /endorsement

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/09/2024: No. Please address comments made in this review.

08/20/2024: No. There are two issues remaining: (1) address comments to uploaded co-financing letter, (2) please upload the PID (or similar public document) that serves as the project document for circulation to GEF Council.

08/29/2024: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement (after the required 4-weeks circulation period for GEF Council comments)

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/9/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/20/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		