

Integrated Watershed Management for Improved Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in the Sepabala Sub-catchment

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10020

Countries

Lesotho

Project Name

Integrated Watershed Management for Improved Agro-pastoral Livelihoods in
the Sepabala Sub-catchment

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/23/2019

Review completed by PM

8/25/2021

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

PIF □
CEO Endorsement □**Project Design and Financing**

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Most of the changes are justified.

However, at PIF level, US\$ 4.65 million of cofinancing in grants were expected: 1) the level of cofinancing has significantly decreased (27%), and most of it is now in-kind (94%). These changes significantly affect the ambition and the expected impact of the project and would need some explanation.

September 17, 2020

Point taken. However, please, keep in mind that the notion of "future cofinancing" does not exist in the GEF system and the project should currently be considered with the justified cofinancing of \$3.4 million. If you succeed in changing the cofinancing situation, you will have to reflect it in the inception report or the first PIR.

Please, explain the role of cofinancing for the eventual purchase of vehicles. For the time being, we are seeing two vehicles charged to the GEF budget (code: 72200). The preference would be to charge these vehicles to cofinancing, either from the government or the cash-cofinancing from UNDP. We understand the need for mobility, but in terms of GEF reasoning, there is no reason for the GEF to cover all the transport equipment. By the way, in the table 3 of the prodoc, a vehicle is assigned to the UNDP cofinancing. However, this vehicle does not seem reported in the annex 9 with the budget. Please, clarify.

August 25, 2021

Cleared.

We take note that no vehicle is budgeted under the GEF grant.

October 5th, 2021

- Please, note that the control quality makes a comment on the operating costs for the vehicle, but this was discussed and accepted by the PM. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Agency Response ? August 2021- to Secretariat comments from Sept 17 2020:

With regards to co-financing for the eventual purchase of vehicles, we have taken GEFSec's advice and moved the vehicle purchase to UNDP co-financing (please see Section 9 ? Total budget and Workplan). We apologize for the confusion regarding the number of vehicles for the project; the intention is to purchase 1 vehicle only, as reflected in Table 3 and Section 9. No vehicle will be purchased using GEF financing.

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments - 26 August 2020:

The unfortunate reduction in the level of co-finance (from the anticipated \$4,65 million at PIF to \$3,4 million committed at CEO ER) and the shift from grants to mainly in-kind support can be explained as follows:

At PIF, all cofinancing was indicated as grant, apparently based on a broad interpretation of 'grant' which incorporated both recurrent expenditures (from MFRSC, MTEC, and MLGCA) and investment mobilized (from UNDP, and the bulk of the anticipated cofinance from the Ministry of Water). Had the commitment letter been obtained from the Ministry of Water as was anticipated, 25% of the cofinance would have represented investment mobilized, instead of the current 6%, which is low, even for a Least Developed Country like Lesotho.

At first submission of the CEO ER, it was not possible to secure the letter of cofinance from the MoW (in the amount of \$1,000,000, much of this derived from parallel investments under the EU/GIZ National Integrated Catchment Management Programme) for a number of unanticipated and unavoidable reasons related to changes in government, including appointment of new incumbents to senior decision-making positions. The decision was taken to submit the CEO ER without the MoW cofinance commitment letter in order to meet the submission deadline, whilst engagements with the MoW continued with a view to securing the cofinance commitment letter before project start.

However, in January 2020, the UNDP CO was informed that before the MoW could issue the letter, the project had to first be approved by the Public Sector Investment Committee (PSIC) under the newly-formed Ministry of Development Planning - which did not exist before, and which now has to approve all donor-funded projects to be implemented in the Kingdom of Lesotho. UNDP Lesotho, working in support of the

MFRSC (the IP), has made multiple presentations in the intervening months in order to secure this approval, which was finally granted by the Principal Secretary for Development Planning on **13 August 2020** (Record of Decision available) - the deliberations of the Committee took a long time, given the newness of the Ministry and operational delays caused by COVID19-related disruptions. Efforts to secure the signed MoW cofinance commitment letter will resume once the newly-appointed Principal Secretary and Minister of Water return to office following field assessments they are currently making of the impacts of COVID-19.

The difference between cofinance anticipated at PIF and committed at CEO ER is as follows:

Source	Name of co-financier	Type	Amount committed	Difference from PIF
Cofinance commitment letters secured				
Govt IP	Ministry of Forestry, Rangelands and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) - Implementing Partner	In-kind (Recurrent expenditures relating to staff time, technical inputs, use of facilities and equipment)	\$2,500,000	Amount unchanged, but contribution will be in-kind, not grant
Govt	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Conservation (MTEC) - Dept. of Environment	In-kind	\$500,000	Amount unchanged, but contribution will be in-kind, not grant
Govt	Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs, though the Quthing District Council	In-kind	\$200,000	Contribution less than was anticipated at PIF, and contribution will be in-kind, not grant
GEF IA	UNDP	Grant (cash)	\$200,000	Unchanged from PIF
Cofinance commitment letter pending				
Govt	Ministry of Water	Parallel investment (grant) and Recurrent Expenditures (in-kind)	Signature pending	\$1,000,000, as anticipated at PIF, grant (parallel investment) and in-kind

Despite this, we believe that the ambition and impact of the Seapala Subcatchment project remains assured as:

- (i) A cofinance commitment letter will still be secured from the MoW. This cofinance accrues from parallel investments in the National Integrated Catchment

Management Programme, which is led by the Ministry of Water and supported financially by the EU with implementation support from GIZ. This programme, which was officially launched at the close of 2019, will invest some \$7 million over the next three years in creating the enabling environment for adoption of ICM, on which successful implementation of the Sebapala project depends. Although the start of activities under the national programme has been slowed due to COVID-19, the investment is secure and the Cabinet has recently approved the new ICM governance structure that the Sebapala project will seek to operationalize at sub-catchment/catchment level. This strengthens the rationale for the Sebapala project.

(ii) The in-kind commitments from the IP (MFRSC), the MTEC and Quthing District Council (under the Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs) will contribute significantly to successful delivery of the Sebapala project - much of this in-kind support will derive from the commitment of time and technical inputs by technical specialists and extension staff from the relevant government departments, as well as thorough use of equipment and facilities. Technical specialists from these government departments will serve on the Technical Secretariat that will guide production of the Sebapala ICM Master Plan, and extension staff (especially at District Level) will be directly involved in training community members and overseeing on-the-ground restoration and SLM activities. Whilst the cofinance commitments are in-kind, they represent a substantive investment in the implementation of the project and will be essential for it to yield the anticipated impacts.

We respectfully request the GEFSec to reconsider this request for CEO ER with the MoW cofinance letter still pending, to avoid any further implementation delays. The project needs to stay well-synchronized with the national ICM programme which is now gathering momentum, much of the initial survey work for the Sebapala project will need to take place in the next few months (spring and summer), and the need to address the issue of livelihoods and food security is now extremely urgent, to address severe hardships induced by the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The level of financing is relatively low, but cannot be changed at this stage.

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- Please note that the letter of cofinancing from UNDP is not correct: it mentions the GEF project 9799 Promoting Conservation, Sustainable Utilization and Fair and Equitable Benefit-sharing from Lesotho's Medicinal and Ornamental Plants for Improved livelihoods. Please, revise.

- Cofinancing has decreased of 27% since the PIF, and worse, 94% of the cofinancing is now in-kind, and not in grants, seriously weakening the reasoning and the potential impact of the whole project. Some explanation would be welcome to understand and accept these changes.

We however appreciate that the cofinancing in grant from UNDP has been maintained.

September 17, 2020

Point taken. Thanks for the revised letter of cofinancing from UNDP. See item 1.

August 25, 2021

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Agency Response ? August 2021- to Secretariat comments from Sept 17 2020:

This is addressed under item 1, above.

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments - 26 August 2020:

- (i) UNDP cofinance letter: The error in the UNDP cofinance letter (for which we apologize) has been corrected and the correct version has been uploaded with this re-submission. The UNDP cofinance commitment remains as was anticipated at PIF, as a cash grant to the project in the amount of \$200,000.
- (ii) Level and nature of cofinancing: - please see the detailed explanation under Point 1 of this Review Sheet, and also under Section A1:4 and 5 of the CEO ER for a full explanation (page 12).

It is expected that a letter of cofinance (representing investment mobilized and recurrent expenditures under the National ICM Programme) will still be secured from the Ministry of Water by project inception. This will increase the amount of committed cofinance and will achieve a better balance between in-kind contributions and investment mobilized. This will reinforce the reasoning for the project and strengthen its impact.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please check information between the core indicators in the portal and the strategic result framework (p51, prodoc), and adjust at least the language in the prodoc, and probably the values:

- The indicator 3.3 (not 3.2) is the number of ha of natural grass and shrublands **restored** - 10,000 ha (in the prodoc you mention soil and water measures and improved grazing that could just be SLM).
- The indicator 4.3 is the number of ha **under SLM** in productive landscapes (agricultural lands, grasslands for instance). Please remove the mention of rehabilitation. Please, note that eligible lands are productive lands in arid, sub-arid, and dry-sub-humid areas (drylands). Wetlands are not included (see the core indicator 3.4 if needed).

August 25, 2021

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments - 26 August 2020:

- Discrepancies between core indicators entered in to the GEF Portal and the SRF have been checked and corrected. As recommended, the relevant language in the Prodoc has been adjusted, as have the values in the SRF, the detailed project M&E Plan (Annex 3 to Prodoc) and in the Core Indicator Worksheet (Annex 10 to Prodoc and Annex E to CEO ER)
- Wetlands have been removed from under Core Indicator 4 (indicator 4.3) and indicator 3.4 (wetlands restored) has been added under Core Indicator 3

- Reference to rehabilitation has been removed (see SRF and also paragraphs 123, 127 and 131 in the Prodoc)

Corrected core indicator values are now:

Core Indicator 3 (Areas of land restored) - total, 11,500 ha, made up as follows:

Indicator 3.3 - areas of natural grass and shrublands restored: 10,000 ha

Indicator 3.4 (added) - wetlands restored: 1,500 ha

Core Indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices) - total 23,000 ha

Indicator 4.3 - area of landscapes under SLM in production systems (incorporating dryland landscapes, such as agricultural lands and rangelands)

Total hectares: 34,500 (unchanged from PIF).

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes. We appreciate the coordination with existing projects, and especially the EU-GIZ programme.

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

NB: The audits included in the M&E plan are charged to the pmc. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

The KM plan stays generic at this stage. However, we understand it may be difficult to provide more information than standard indicators (= 4 reports, 8 best practices, 1

national workshop and proceedings, and participation in 2 regional or national events with reports). Complete, if possible.

September 17, 2020

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

•UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments - 26 August 2020:

The knowledge management plan for the project was kept relatively generic (especially with regard to the indicators/targets for knowledge products), as finer details will be fleshed out in the Seapala Communications and Knowledge Management Framework, which will be developed during the first six months of implementation. This project-specific C&KM Framework also needs to be closely aligned with the national-scale ICM Knowledge Management Framework that is still to be developed under the EU/GIZ-supported National ICM Programme (framework to be completed during the 2020-2021 operational year) - it will be important to ensure that the national and Seapala-level KM plans are well-aligned and complementary.

This notwithstanding, some adjustments have been made to the narrative in the Prodoc (under paragraph 151, and newly-inserted footnotes) and in the SRF (in the Prodoc and CEO ER) to sharpen up the KM plan, as follows:

- ? A project-specific Communications and Knowledge Management Framework, a web-based knowledge management system, and a Seapala ICM Community Advocacy Programme
- ? 4 Technical Reports/Policy Briefs including at least: 1 report on implementation of the indigenous grass re-seeding pilot in Seapala Sub-catchment; Lessons learnt from implementation of Lesotho's new governance model for ICM at the watershed/sub-catchment level
- ? 8 best practice case studies/lessons learnt communications pieces, including at least one each on: the role of women in adoption of ICM in the Seapala Sub-catchment; lessons learnt reports (capturing lessons from at least 2 local-level knowledge sharing events and 1 national event); at least one case study on the Seapala Community Advocacy Programme (to be published through a platform such as IUCN Panorama Solutions, or other relevant platform); and at least one photo-essay to capture human-interest stories, published through the UNDP EBD Ecosystems and Biodiversity Exposure platform

New text has also been added to the CEO ER under Section 8 on Knowledge Management:

It will also identify synergies with all existing GEF-financed projects in Lesotho, and other projects to start during its lifetime, including most notably the EU/GIZ-supported National Integrated Catchment Management Programme which is led by the Ministry of Water. The project will contract the part-time services of a Communications and Knowledge Management Consultant to assist with delivery of outputs under Outcome 4 of the UNDP Project Document, including the development and implementation of a Communications and Knowledge Management Framework, which will be used to plan, direct and track the project's knowledge management functions and performance. It will also detail specifics of the knowledge products to be delivered, following the minimum-set guidance as outlined in the Prodoc and SRF.

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, there are documented responses to comments made by the STAP.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Comments from the German Council Member were included in the project development. We appreciate the connection with the EU-GIZ programme.

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
October 5th, 2021

All remaining points are addressed: the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

September 17, 2021

Please address the following comments from Quality Control:

1. Project Information in the portal:

- Per the text below, it seems that the executing agency will be the Ministry of Forestry. If this is the case, please remove the other ministries from the Executing list.

- However, it seems that other Ministries, including Tourism/Environment/Culture and Agriculture/Food Security will have an executing role (meaning using GEF resources to implement activities/outputs, with a budget). This is the reason why these Ministries provide cofinancing, staff, and resources?. If this is the right understanding of the project arrangements, it should then be reflected in the ?institutional arrangements and coordination? section of the portal and in the project document.

- We need constituency and either the list of executing partners or the project arrangements should be revised.

Implementing Partner: This project is implemented under the National Implementation Modality (NIM). The implementing Partner is the Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) as envisaged in the PIF. A detailed organogram and description of roles and responsibilities for each partner involved in project governance and coordination is provided in Prodoc [Section 7 - Governance and Management Arrangements](#). UNDP is responsible for delivering GEF project cycle management services comprising project approval and start-up, project supervision and oversight, and project completion and evaluation. UNDP is also responsible for the Project Assurance role of the Project Board/Steering Committee. UNDP has not been requested to perform any direct **execution** duties.

Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ

Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) Ministry of Water (MoW) - Department of Water Affairs Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture (MTEC) - Department of Environment Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs (MLGCA)

2. On co-financing: the three co-financing letters for \$500,000, \$2,500,000 and \$200,000 set up an execution period between 2020 and 2024. Most likely this project

will start implementation on 2022. Since the end of that period for the co-finance funds will be half way through the project implementation period, please review and include a co-financing amount that sounds reasonable given the period of time left for these co-finance funds.

Re: Co-financing for the GEF6 Project "Integrated Watershed Management for improved agro-pastoral livelihoods in the Sebapala sub-catchment"

Within the framework of the GEF6 project "Integrated Watershed Management for improved agro-pastoral livelihoods in the Sebapala sub-catchment", financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation in partnership with UNDP as a GEF Agency, the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture is one of key technical ministries that will be supporting implementation of this project. Our co-financing contribution in-kind to achieve the project's objectives will be USD 500,000 during the execution period from 2020 to 2024. The amount will be as follows:

Source / Type	Amount	
	Local Currency	USD
Grant (In-Kind)	7,500,000	500,000
Total	7,500,000	500,000

Ms. Betty Wabunoha
 UNDP Resident Representative
 United Nations Development Programme
 Lesotho

Dear Ms. Wabunoha,

Re: Co-financing for the GEF6 Project "Integrated Watershed Management for improved agro-pastoral livelihoods in the Sebapala sub-catchment"

Within the framework of the GEF6 project "Integrated Watershed Management for improved agro-pastoral livelihoods in the Sebapala sub-catchment", financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation in partnership with UNDP as a GEF Agency and our co-financing contribution in-kind to achieve the project's objectives will be USD 2,500,000 during the execution period from 2020 to 2024. The amount will be as follows:

Source / Type	Amount	
	Local Currency	USD
Grant (In-Kind)	37,500,000	2,500,000
Total	37,500,000	2,500,000

This co-financing will be executed in an independent manner with management, follow-up, and monitoring systems as applicable and according to the policies and procedures of UNDP. This project is very important for our institution and the sustainable development of the country. In addition, it complements our institutional policies and plans.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,



Ms. Maseithati Mabeleng

Principal Secretary – Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation

Dear Ms. Wabunoha,

Re: Co-financing for the GEF6 Project "Integrated Watershed Management for improved agro-pastoral livelihoods in the Sebapala sub-catchment"

Within the framework of the GEF6 project "Integrated Watershed Management for improved agro-pastoral livelihoods in the Sebapala sub-catchment", financed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and implemented by Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation in partnership with UNDP as a GEF Agency. Ministry of Local Government and Chieftainship Affairs through Quthing District Council is one of key ministries that will be supporting implementation of this project and our co-financing contribution in-kind to achieve the project's objectives will be USD 200,000 during the execution period from 2020 to 2024. The amount will be as follows:

Source / Type	Amount	
	Local Currency	USD
Grant (In-Kind)	3,000,000	200,000
Total	3,000,000	200,000

This co-financing will be executed in an independent manner with management, follow-up, and monitoring systems as applicable and according to the policies and procedures of UNDP. This project is very important for our institution and the sustainable development of the country. In addition, it complements our institutional policies and plans.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,



Mr. Rorisang Motsopa



District Council Secretary - Quthing

3. On M&E: Please, remove Audits from the M&E budget and kindly allocate those expenses to the PMC

Audit	Appointed auditors for project audits	Per year: 3,000 (small project budget)	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies.
TOTAL indicative COST		101,600 (4 % of UNDP and GEF grants)	
Excluding oversight/project assurance costs. Project implementation costs to be included in Component 4 KM and M&E outcome in TBWP.			
Audit	Appointed auditors for project audits	Per year: 3,000 (small project budget)	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies.
TOTAL indicative COST		101,600 (4 % of UNDP and GEF grants)	
Excluding oversight/project assurance costs. Project implementation costs to be included in Component 4 KM and M&E outcome in TBWP.			

4. Please, include Maps in the CEO endorsement form

5. Budget:

a. Project inception workshop has to be charged to the M&E, not to the PMC

Training, Workshops, Meetings	This budget is reserved to meet the costs of meetings and training events linked to the PMU, to ensure good governance as follows: a) Project Inception Workshop: \$5,000, 1 b) Quarterly Project Board meetings: \$5,000, over four years Total \$10,000																Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MF RSC)
-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

b. Please, remove ineligible items such as Insurance, Bank expenses and miscellaneous cost.

Other Operating Costs	This budget is reserved to cover insurances and other miscellaneous costs. Total: \$8,000, evenly distributed over four years.				8,000	8,000			8,000	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MF RSC)
Other Operating Costs	This budget is reserved for costs of insurances, bank charges and other miscellaneous expenses. Total: \$687							687	687	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MF RSC)

c. The total M&E cost under the budget does not match the total in the M&E Budget. Please, double check and confirm that all item match

Audit	Appointed auditors for project audits	Per year: 3,000 (small project budget)	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies.
TOTAL Indicative COST		101,600 (4% of UNDP and GEF grants)	
Excluding oversight/project assurance costs. Project implementation costs to be included in Component 4 KM and M&E outcome in TBWP			

Other Operating Costs	Bank charges and other miscellaneous expenses Total: \$687						687	687	and Soil Conservation (MF RSC)
Grand Total		375,000	156,585	1,330,154	1,861,739	140,000	100,087	2,101,826	

August 25, 2021

A COVID Response Strategy is included in the prodoc. Some sections of the prodoc (risks, mitigation measures) were also updated.

The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

September 17, 2020

This project was initially reviewed in January 2020 before the COVID-19 situation. Please, check the new guidelines on COVID-19 and especially the recommendations in Project Design in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics. Please, include a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent risks and opportunities relative to specific context for the project, including 1) COVID-19 risk analysis and response measures, 2) Opportunities to support COVID-19 response in the short-term (e.g. job creation and training, local economic development, productivity improvements, improved access to essential services, public health benefits, etc.), and 3) Opportunities to support COVID-19 response in the long-term (e.g. strengthen supply chains, consistent with long-term decarbonization targets, avoid lock-in of carbon or energy

intensive infrastructure, increase natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity, protect natural capital, limit human-wildlife contact, etc.).

If necessary, please, revise the taxonomy to reflect response measures and opportunities.

In terms of project staff, we understand that the project manager is charged at 50% under the pmc, 20% under the component 2 and 30% under the component 3. This breakdown reflects the different tasks assigned to the project manager, as described in the terms of reference. Cleared.

January 2nd, 2020

Not yet. Please see the items 1, 5, 6, and 10.

Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments ? 21 September 2021 ? to Secretariat comments from 2 September 2021

GEF Sec comment	Action taken	Notes
<p>1. Project Information in the portal: [redacted] Per the text below, it seems that the executing agency will be [redacted] the <u>Ministry of Forestry</u>. If this is the case, please remove the other ministries from the Executing list.</p>	<p>The the text in the GEF project information portal was changed so that ONLY the Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation is reflect as executing agency. Other ministries were removed from the list.</p>	

<p>2. On co-financing: the three co-financing letters for \$500,000, \$2,500,000 and \$200,000 set up an execution period between 2020 and 2024. Most likely this project will start implementation on 2022. Since the end of that period for the co-finance funds will be halfway through the project implementation period, please review and include a co-financing amount that sounds reasonable given the period of time left for these co-finance funds.</p>	<p>Addenda to the three co-financing letters were produced by the three ministries. They indicate that the co-financing is available for the adjusted project period 2022 ? 2026.</p>	<p>Please see three addenda to the three co-financing letters.</p>
<p>3. On M&E: Please, remove Audits from the M&E budget and kindly allocate those expenses to the PMC</p>	<p>Audits reallocated from M&E to PMC, and revisions to ProDoc and CEO ER were made where required.</p>	<p>Please see revised Table 2, page 59 of the ProDoc. Also see revised table on page 26 of CEO ER.</p>
<p>4. Please, include Maps in the CEO endorsement form</p>	<p>Maps added CEO ER as annex G.</p>	<p>Please see text on page 7 and maps in new Annex G.</p>
<p>5. Budget: a. Project inception workshop has to be charged to the M&E, not to the PMC</p>	<p>Reallocated inception workshop from PMC to M&E.</p>	<p>Please see Budget on page 68 and budget note 26. Also see revised table on page 26 of CEO ER.</p>
<p>b. Please, remove ineligible items such as Insurance, Bank expenses and miscellaneous cost.</p>	<p>Ineligible items removed ineligible items from the budget.</p>	

<p>c. The total M&E cost under the budget does not match the total in the M&E Budget. Please, double check and confirm that all items match.</p>	<p>The total in the M&E budget (Table 2 on page 59) does not match with the M&E budget in the project budget (page 68) because the total budget for component 4 includes knowledge management and gender mainstreaming budgets.</p>	
--	---	--

UNDP Agency Response ? August 2021- to Secretariat comments from Sept 17 2020:

A COVID-19 Response Strategy for the project has been prepared and included in the ProDoc as Annex 20. It includes an overview of the impacts of COVID on the country, government response, COVID-19 risk analysis and mitigation measures, and opportunities to support COVID-19 response in the short term and long term. Please see page 48 of the ProDoc and Annex 5 (Atlas Risks Log and mitigation measures) for updates relating to COVID-19. Changes have also been made to Section A.5 of the CEO Endorsement Request which deals with risks and mitigation measures.

UNDP Agency Response to Secretariat comments - 26 August 2020:

We are grateful to the GEFSec for the helpful review. Full responses have been provided under items 1, 5, 6, and 10, with corresponding adjustments made in the Prodoc and/or CEO Endorsement Request, or Annexes, as specified.

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
<p>First Review</p>	<p>1/2/2020</p>	

**Secretariat comment at CEO
Endorsement Request**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	9/17/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/25/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/5/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations