

Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11101

Countries

Zambia

Project Name

Eastern Province Jurisdictional Sustainable Landscape Program

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

4/7/2023

Review completed by PM

4/11/2023

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

CEO Approval Request

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
June 27, 2023

It seems you missed some comments from the control quality in the last cell. Let us repeat them here:

1. On stakeholder engagement: Please ask agency to clearly reference the annex on stakeholder engagement plan in the portal section.
2. On Knowledge management: An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description. Project proposal includes KM and learning deliverables, facilitation of information and knowledge exchange, collaborative platforms, training events, workshops, field visits, prize scheme, knowledge materials, publications, reports, training events as well as results/lessons shared through TV, radio, and social media. A budget has been provided. However, there is no mention of a communications strategy/plan. Thus, the agency is requested to provide a brief description of a Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results. This should also be properly reflected in the project's budget and timeline.
3. On project information: please request the agency to correct the region. ADDRESSED

Region:	Zambia	GEF Project ID:	11101
Country(ies):	Zambia	Type of Project:	MSP
GEF Agency(ies):	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	P155827

4. On the PMC: please request the agency to exclude, from component 3, the amount used for PMC (from the co-financing) and to include this in the PMC section. ADDRESSED

	Sub Total (\$)	2,000,000.00	31,000,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)			
GET			
Sub Total(\$)		0.00	0.00
Total Project Cost(\$)		2,000,000.00	31,000,000.00

Please provide justification
 PMC is financed through the co-financing and is included under component 3 above.

5. On the budget: the budget provided in Annex G cannot be approved as is. It does not include any kind of information on the activities that will be funded through this project. Please request the agency to provide a detailed budget with information on each activity/item line so one can assess the reasonability of these being charged to either project components, M&E or PMC if appropriate.

ANNEX G: BUDGET TABLE

Please upload the budget table here.

Title

GEF_Project_Budget_ER Project

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template - GEF financing

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)							Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity <small>(Executing Entity receives from the GEF Agency)</small>
		Component 1: Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan	Component 2: Strengthening communities and governance for sustainable land management	Component 3: Program Management (Startup Funding)	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC			
Contractual Services – Company	One or more firms will be hired to carry out the community capacity building and training activities identified under component 2.		2,000,000						2,000,000	Ministry of Green Ecor and Environment
Grand Total			2,000,000							

April 11, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 11, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

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 results?
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 11, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
- b) 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?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 11, 2023

The project is very interesting. The GEF resources will be used to bridge the ending REDD+ project to the first payments from the BioCarbon Fund.

Addressed.

Agency Response

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
April 11, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

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 thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**
- b) 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?**
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks are properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- d) 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?**
- e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- f) 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?**
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this MSP)?**
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- i) 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 description/s?**
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**
- k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**
- l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
June 27, 2023

Addressed.

April 11, 2023

There is a robust stakeholder plan. Social inclusion, Gender issues, customary land tenure arrangements, transparency are integrated. We appreciate very much the integration of lessons from past programs and projects on similar Emission Reduction mechanisms, highlighting the importance of integration, cross-sector approaches on a wide range of landscape activities and stakeholders. The Country Assistance Strategy (2013-2017) was also a support from lessons. We are also seeing this project as a capacity building support to the Central government and decentralized authorities. The Environmental risks stay moderate.

We would like however to get the attention of the GEF Agency on activities that could potentially affect the existing national parks in the Eastern Province. We also recommend avoiding the displacement of populations. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

WB: June 23, 2023

The proposed activities are expected to have a positive impact on the national parks, if any, by promoting sustainable land management practices to reduce forest loss and degradation, including in and around national parks. Moreover, component 2 financed by the GEF will provide training for community members and scouts, who will work in collaboration with the Department of Forestry and the Department of National Parks and Wildlife, to enhance protected area management and monitoring, including biodiversity monitoring.

We would like to clarify that no World Bank financing provided under the Zambia Integrated Forest Landscapes Project (ZIFLP) led to any resettlement. Instead, the resettlement issue was a pre-existing matter in the Eastern Province that ZIFLP aimed to address. To provide some background, between 2012 and 2015, approximately 200 households relocated into the legally established protected area of Lukusuzi National Park in the Eastern Province. However, they were subsequently removed from the park between 2014 and 2015.

During the preparation of the ZIFLP, the World Bank requested the client to conduct a resettlement review to assess the situation of those who were relocated, as a significant number of them resided within the project's target area. The purpose of this review was to evaluate the process followed during their removal and the adequacy of the compensation provided. The findings from this review helped identify key issues and gaps, resulting in the development of an action plan. The implementation of this action plan was funded by the Government of Zambia, utilizing its own resources as well as funds from the ZIFLP.

Regarding the proposed Program and Emission Reduction Project no resettlement is anticipated. However, as a precautionary measure, a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) and a Resettlement Process Framework (PF) have been prepared to address any potential risks associated with involuntary land acquisition during the project's lifespan. In accordance with

best practices, the RPF has been developed in the unlikely event that a World Bank-supported activity necessitates involuntary land acquisition. Should such a case arise, the borrower would be required to submit a Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) for the World Bank's review and approval.

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.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
April 11, 2023

Addressed.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

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

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core 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
June 27, 2023

Partially addressed.

- The second comment is not addressed: per guidelines, the CI6 on carbon gains must be given on a 20-period. You can use your data to feed an EXACT table or any other tool to adjust the period to 20 years.

April 11, 2023

- We take note of the main target of 350,000 ha under CI4.3 on Sustainable Land Management. Please confirm this target and the value when you will have clarified or confirmed the use of LD1 and LD2 Objective.

- We take note of the carbon results. Please express the CI 6 on a 20-year period per the guidelines (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results_Framework_Guidelines_2022_06_30.pdf).

Agency Response

WB June 23, 2023:

The project will use only the LD1 focal area objective. The target of 350,000 under CI 4.3 remains.

We have updated the target for CI6 to 29,416,004 tCO₂e avoided over the 8 year-period 2023-2031. This target is derived from the detailed GHG inventory and accounting that was carried out for the Emissions Reduction Program Document (ERPD) and are uploaded as an annex to the portal.

5.4 Risks

- a) **Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Are the key risks that might affect implementation and adequately rated?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 27, 2023

Addressed.

April 11, 2023

- We take note of the moderate risk rating. However, we would like to get the attention of the GEF Agency on activities that could potentially affect the existing national parks in the Eastern Province. We also recommend avoiding the displacement of populations, as it happened in the past around the Lukusuzi National Park.

Cleared.

Agency Response

WB June 23, 23:

Please see response above re: national parks and resettlement.

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 27, 2023

Addressed.

April 11, 2023

Please, confirm you want to assign this project to both the LD1 objective (SLM) and the LD2 objective (Restoration).

In several sections of the text, you mention sustainable land management and/or restoration of 350,000 ha of landscapes. However, you only fixed a target of 350,000 ha under SLM (core indicator 4.3) and no target under the core indicator 3 related to restoration. Please, clarify and justify. Thanks.

Agency Response

WB June 23, 2023:

We will assign this project to only LD1 objective (SLM). This has been updated in the portal.

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

June 27, 2023

Addressed.

April 11, 2023

Uncomplete.

The proposed project is consistent with the Zambia's national development strategies and climate commitments, as well as the Zambia Country Partnership Framework FY19-23. We can understand that the National Action Programme (NAP) under UNCCD is not mentioned, as the document is not up-to-date (2002). However, Zambia endorsed Land Degradation Neutrality Targets (LDN) in 2019 in their vision to combat land degradation and achieve ecosystem integrity. These LDN targets should be at minimum mentioned and if possible analyzed as this project may significantly contribute to these LDN targets. Please, complete.

https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/ldn_targets/2019-10/Zambia%20LDN%20Country%20Commitments.pdf

Agency Response

WB June 23, 2023:

We have included reference to how the project will support Zambia's LDN targets in the portal section, Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies.

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 NA

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request PPO

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?

b) 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 NA

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

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

June 27, 2023

Addressed.

April 11, 2023

\$31 million are entered as cofinancing with \$30 million from the BioCarbon fund to purchase emissions reduction credits and \$ 1 million provided as a grant for technical assistance. This information is consistent with the PAD: \$22 million are expected from the Biocarbon fund, with additional \$9 million expected by the end of the project.

The evidence for this cofinancing is a "letter of support" anticipating \$22 million from the Biocarbon fund and additional \$9 million "might be" expected by the end of the project in case the BioCF T3 was underutilized. The language is very cautious. We are requesting the Quality control to check if this letter of support is acceptable as well as the amount entered in the portal.

Agency Response

WB June 23, 2023:

We have reduced the co-financing amount in the portal to \$22 million, which is the firm commitment from the BioCarbon Fund. We expect that the additional \$9 million from the BioCarbon Fund will be provided to the project, and if it is we will report this at project completion. The co-financing letter remains unchanged.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) 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

April 11, 2023

There is a letter of endorsement in date of January 23, 2023, signed by Mr. Godwin Fishani GONDWE, GEF OFP for Zambia.

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

c) 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 Yes

Agency Response

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 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 the budget (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?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 27, 2023

Addressed.

Yes. see the item related to the core indicators.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 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

June 27, 2023

PPO: see Travel, office supplies...

April 11, 2023

The budget template is not really used. However, we understand the logic to use the GEF funds as a bridge between the ending REDD+ projects and the Emission Reduction Purchases. The GEF resources will be used under the component 2 to strengthen communities and governance for SLM. One or two firms will be hired for contractual services. See comment from the Quality control below (last item).

Agency Response

WB: June 23, 2023

We have provided more detail in the budget template on how the GEF funds will be utilized to support component 2.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.11 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on

the following selection 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 Request NA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 27, 2023

Some comments above have not been addressed. The project cannot be recommended yet.

April 11, 2023

Not yet. Please address the comments above + control quality below.

1. On stakeholder engagement: Please ask agency to clearly reference the annex on stakeholder engagement plan in the portal section.
2. On Knowledge management: An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description. Project proposal includes KM and learning deliverables, facilitation of information and knowledge exchange, collaborative platforms, training events, workshops, field visits, prize scheme, knowledge materials, publications, reports, training events as well as results/lessons shared through TV, radio, and social media. A budget has been provided. However, there is no mention of a communications strategy/plan. Thus, the agency is requested to provide a brief description of a Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results. This should also be properly reflected in the project's budget and timeline.
3. On project information: please request the agency to correct the region.

Region:	Zambia	GEF Project ID:	11101
Country(ies):	Zambia	Type of Project:	MSP
GEF Agency(ies):	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	P155827

4. On the PMC: please request the agency to exclude, from component 3, the amount used for PMC (from the co-financing) and to include this in the PMC section.

Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET		
	Sub Total(\$)	0.00	0.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	2,000,000.00	31,000,000.00
Please provide justification			
PMC is financed through the co-financing and is included under component 3 above.			

5. On the budget: the budget provided in Annex G cannot be approved as is. It does not include any kind of information on the activities that will be funded through this project. Please request the agency to provide a detailed budget with information on each activity/item line so one can assess the reasonability of these being charged to either project components, M&E or PMC if appropriate.

ANNEX G: BUDGET TABLE

Please upload the budget table here. ⓘ

Title

GEF_Project_Budget_ER Project

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template - GEF financing

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)							Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity <small>(Executing Entity receives from the GEF Agency)</small>		
		Component 1: Emission Reductions payments distributed in accordance with agreed Benefit Sharing Plan		Component 2: Strengthening communities and governance for sustainable land management		Component 3: Program Management (Startup Funding)		Sub-Total			M&E	PMC
Contractual Services – Company	One or more firms will be hired to carry out the community capacity building and training activities identified under component 2.			2,000,000							2,000,000	Ministry of Green Ecor and Environment
Grand Total				2,000,000								

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- Pay attention to activities in or near protected areas (Luangwa national parks, Lukusuzi, Luambe).
- Please, do your best to avoid resettlement of people.
- Confirm cofinancing in the future Project Implementation Reports.

9.3 Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/11/2023	6/23/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		