



Food Systems Integrated Program

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11214

Countries

Global (Angola, Argentina, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, India, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Namibia, Nauru, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Türkiye, Uganda, Indonesia)

Project Name

Food Systems Integrated Program

Agencies

FAO, World Bank, UNDP, IUCN, IFAD

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

11/21/2023

Program Manager

Peter Umunay

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

11/01/2023 PU

Unless the Agency really wants to submit all child projects for CEO Endorsement / CEO Approval 10 months after Council approval of the PFD, the Program Commitment Deadline should be 18 months after Council approval in Feb 2024, which means 9 August 2025

GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:	12/31/2024
---------------------	------------------	------------------------------	------------

LoEs review:

LOEs from Uganda and Kazakhstan are missing.

The following LOEs have different child project name than in Portal, please correct Portal to match the LOEs: Indonesia, Tanzania, Turkiye, Nigeria

The following LOEs have different executing partner name than in Portal, please correct Portal to match the LOEs: India, Malaysia, Ecuador, Angola, Namibia, Ghana

Core Indicators:

Please consider ensuring that the sum of Core and Sub-Indicator values across child projects adds up to the value entered at PFD level.

5/17/2023 PU

All PPOs comments cleared/corrected. Only Kenya LOE submission is delayed.

5/17/2023 PU

PPOs second set of comments (dated today: 05-16-2023) is below:

Most of the comments provided on April 23rd were addressed, but some others were not:

1. Financial numbers: please correct the mismatches between the Sources of funds table and the Financing + PPG tables for the following countries: it is advisable to correct the financing table and PPG table to match with Sources of funds table while keeping current break-down in Sources of funds table unchanged:

2. Letters of Endorsement review:

a. Kenya LOE shows different STAR allocation than in Portal ? please ask the Agency to amend by obtaining a new LoE.

b. Project title is different between LOE and Portal for Costa Rica, China, India, Indonesia. Please change Portal to match with LOE.

c. Pakistan LOE is not signed by the OFP. Revised LOE signed by current OFP is required.

d. Ethiopia LOE has different executing entity from Portal. Please change Portal to match with LOE. Also the LOE is not signed by the current OFP who took office since 10th April 2023. Revised LOE signed by current OFP is required.

3. Co-financing: at PIF stage, the co-financiers need to be identified. Please let's request the agency to consider including the name of private sectors if they are identified, otherwise please remove them.

- The TNC is not a private sector. Please consider revising the ?private sector? to ?Civil Society Organization?

5/16/2023 PU

Cleared

4/27/2023 PU

The Anticipated Program Executing Entities are bundled in one line, which not only is inaccurate (i.e., in Costa Rica the anticipated executing entity is Conservation International), but also leads to a mistake in the Type (not all can be classified as ?Government?) ? please fill out this information using individual rows so each executing entity can be correctly classified.

Please confirm if there is an agreement with all other participant Agencies regarding the Program Commitment Deadline of 12 months after PFD approval (this is the first time a PFD sets a Program Commitment Deadline of 12 months after PFD approval instead of 18 months ? if so, there is no need to do anything)

Program Title:	Food Systems Integrated Program	
Country(ies):	Global, Argentina, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Chad, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Eswatini, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Peru, Philippines, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Türkiye	GEF Program ID:
Lead GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Program ID:
Other GEF Agenc(ies):	IFAD UNDP IUCN	Submission Date :
Type of Trust Fund:	GET	
Anticipated Program Executing Entity(s):	Ministries	Anticipated Program Executing Partner Type(s):
Sector (only for Programs on CC): ❶	AFOLU	Program Duration (Months):
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

-Noted, date has been updated to 9 August 2025

-Uganda LOE has been included. Kazakhstan is pending

-Portal has been updated to ensure that (i) child project name in portal matches LOE, (ii) executing partner in portal matches LOE, and (iii) that sum of core and sub-indicator values across child projects adds up to the value entered at PFD level.

10 May 2023

Noted. This has been corrected as follows:

- Anticipated Executing Entities have been each included in a single line and correctly classified

- Program commitment deadline is 18 months (as per GEF guidelines). Assuming the Program is approved in June 2023, the deadline has been set for December 2024

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

2. Program Summary

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

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

5/16/2023PU

Cleared

4/27/2023 PU

Program objective: To catalyse the transformation to sustainable and regenerative food systems that are nature positive, climate resilient, and pollution-free.

What metric will be used to measure the degree by which the program has catalyzed the transformation?? Is there metric that can objectively measure this? A more pragmatic and measurable program objective could be: ?To increase/expand/strengthen sustainable and regenerative food systems that are nature positive, climate resilient, and pollution-free.?

a. Cleared

b. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

General response:

We consider that ?increase/expand/strengthen? would imply merely incremental, quantitative changes, rather than the transformation that is stressed in GEF Programming Directions and STAP guidance. We suggest that the following indicators proposed in the results framework do provide objective measures of whether transformation is being catalysed:

- Numbers of partnership agreements on catalysing transformation of food systems and scaling at national, regional & global levels (by type/level, numbers and type of members, and issue/sector covered).
- Number of international frameworks revised/developed in favour of FS sustainability
- Number of countries with investment pathways under development and implementation in support of food system transformation
- Volume of finance USD mobilized (at global level) and deployed for investment in FS transformation (by country, and sector)
- Enhanced awareness of FS sustainability issues among actors at all stages (from farm to table) and levels of food systems worldwide (by issue and type of beneficiary, including socioeconomic level and gender)

We also propose to include an additional indicator as follows: *?Increase in the proportion/volume of the targeted VCs marketed products from each of the target sectors traded in accordance with credible sustainability standards reflecting GEBs and co-benefits?:* this constitutes a measure of catalysing progress towards achieving a tipping point of market insertion of sustainable produce, beyond which sustainability will become the ?new normal?.

No response required for (a.) and (b.)

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

- a. Cleared
- b. Cleared ? some discussions on the ToC in Program Description section
- c. Cleared
- d. This is all well, except some issues with a few countries that need clarifications. More details in Annex, Financing table section.
- e. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required in this section

4 Program Outline

A. Program 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 program design?
- b) Has 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 program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?
- c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?
- d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?
- e) For NGL, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

- a. Cleared
- b. Cleared: all stakeholders will be engaged in the program - Private sector is seen both side stakeholder and co-financier
- c. Cleared
- d. Cleared ? Yes, both Good Growth Partnership (GEF-6 GGP) and Food, Land Use and Restoration (GEF-7 FOLUR) experiences and results will be leveraged.
- e. N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key 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?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program 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? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

5/16/2023 PU

Cleared

4/26/2023 PU

a. Cleared ? The Theory of Change diagram maps the Program Goal and GEBs to the SDGs. While this is important, the GEF mandate is in fact to serve the MEAs. Could the latter be reflected instead, especially the Rio Conventions and latest COP decisions (i.e., GBF, etc.)?

b. Cleared ? Good Growth Partnership (GEF-6 GGP) and Food, Land Use and Restoration (GEF-7 FOLUR) lessons and experiences, including lessons from UN Food Systems Summit and COVID-19 pandemic are featured to justify programmatic approach.

c. Cleared

d. Cleared

e. Cleared

f. Cleared

g. Cleared

h. Cleared

i. Cleared ? this is clearly explained and considered as component 1 of the overall program.

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

a. We have modified the ToC diagram to include the following, on the same level as SDGs (which we consider should still be referred to, as this will ensure stronger cross-sectoral buy-in at country level: ?Significant & durable GEBs (BD, LD, CC) contributing to commitments under UNCBD, UNCCD and UNFCCC and Kunming-Montreal GBF targets 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14-16, 18-23?

No response required for (b.) to (i.)

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

a. Cleared

b. Cleared

c. Cleared

d. Cleared

e. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

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

Secretariat's Comments

11/01/2023 PU

GCP as a CP and GCP as a programmatic approach - how the overall programmatic approach is going to be delivered? PLEASE EXPLAIN - I am unable to locate the GCP Child Project Concept. The document of 418 pages "GEF-8 CHILD PROJECT CONCEPT" doesn't contain "Food Systems Integrated Program Global Coordination Project"

Governance structure (Fig.5) - no other agencies (e.g., UNDP, WBCSD, TNC, etc...); too inward looking and not outward looking with somehow arrows one way traffic. Consider reviewing this governance structure to represent the overall programmatic approach to achieve transformational change (see diagram during the GCP workshop). GEFSEC should also be connected to the Steering Committee.

5/16/2023 PU

Cleared

4/27/2023 PU

a. By super-imposing ?country child projects? and ?global coordination project? on Fig.2 ? FSIP Ambition appears to imply that GEBs generated at country level do not accrue to the regional/global level. But rather, GEBs are generated globally and separately from those at country level. This could raise questions about how scale and ambition is perceived relative to the program structure. This needs to be clarified.

The Governance Framework (Figure 5) is very ?inward looking? in the sense that all aspects within the central box are exclusive to the IP. This is purely coordination and will

have little influence per se on food systems. For example, how and where would important entities and initiatives be engaged to build trust and ownership for the ambition laid out in Figure 2? Since the multi-partner PMAG is outside that box, how will their advice be anchored in that central box?

b. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

The governance section and governance structure (Fig 5) have been updated in the PFD and the GCP Concept note to include the results from the design workshop in Rome on October 2023.

GCP Child Concept Note is now included in the single document containing all Child Projects. Apologies for the oversight.

10 May 2023

a. Response in two parts below:

Part 1: Country child projects and GCP

The figure (which is in fact Fig. 1) has been modified to make it clearer that the overall impacts of the IP in transforming global food systems will result from the sum of the large-scale impacts generated in the geographies and value chains covered by the 22 child projects, and the scaling effects generated by the IP beyond the specific geographical limits of the child projects, covering whole food systems, value chains and regions.

The GCP will play vital roles in both dimensions: it will maximize the impacts of the child projects by bringing favourable global conditions and systemic shifts to bear on them, as well as crowding in and channelling to them technical and financial support and knowledge, value chain opportunities and partnerships; at the same time it will catalyse broader scaling, by putting the knowledge, models and messages developed through the child projects on the global policy agenda in order to influence the global ?rules of the game?, and by stimulating the formation of partnerships and coalitions that will eventually affect ways of doing business across whole regions and sectors. This will be measured through the transformation metrics referred to in response to the earlier question.

Part 2: Governance Framework

Figure 4 has been further developed to emphasize how the hubs will serve as conduits for the engagement of external actors. Further supporting text has also been added to the descriptions of the hubs under paragraph 142, and a new paragraph 143 has been added, explaining how the GCP structure will permit engagement of external actors in relations of trust, co-ownership and co-creation.

A box has also been added to Figure 5 to highlight the relation between the GCP and food systems platforms/actors, acting as a conduit for relations between child projects and these actors.

Regarding the anchoring of the PAG, text has been added as follows: ?Relevant members of the PAG will meet (as needed, and as requested by the IP co-leads, Steering Committee members, partners and/or agencies), to advise on specific policy, strategic or technical issues?.

b. No response required

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) 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/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

c) Are the program?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?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptative management?

Secretariat's Comments

[5/12/2023 PU](#)

[Cleared](#)

[4/26/2023 PU](#)

a. Cleared ? By super-imposing ?country child projects? and ?global coordination project? on Fig.2 ? FSIP Ambition appears to imply that GEBs generated at country level do not accrue to the regional/global level. But rather, GEBs are generated globally and separately from those at country level. This could raise questions about how scale and ambition is perceived relative to the program structure. This needs to be clarified.

b. Program objective. The Program objective statement indicates ?to catalyze?. Kindly ensure that this aspect is measurable by program completion through adequate outcome indicators as the Program will be assessed against its objective. These indicators are discussed but not clearly listed in the M&E section

c. Core Indicators.

o Indicator 4.4 Please upload any information on HCVF forests covered as appropriate and available.

o Indicator 4.5 Please ensure the full extent of OECMs planned to be covered by the Program are listed. OECMs do not aggregate up to the main Core Indicator 4. This means the same area listed under sub-indicator 4.1 can also be marked as an OECM under 4.5. In addition, please indicate any other information as available: Name, WDPA ID.

d. Cleared

e. Cleared

Please clarify the repartition of GHG emission reductions across sub-indicators ? currently, no explanation is provided on the reason for the share of reductions outside of AFOLU, and it is unclear why indirect GHG emissions are not accounted for.

Please clarify how the impact of the global platform child project is accounted for given that the current PFD outlines that it has an impact captured at country level, but country level projects do not identify the role of the global platform in their justifications.

Revise the justification of alignment with the CCM1.4 objective as well as the underlying activities and theory of change in order to focus on agricultural practices and levers of GHG emission reductions that are in line with the GEF-8 CCM strategic priorities and that demonstrate cost-effectiveness ? currently, the estimate of CCM GEBs is by several factors below what would be expected based on previous GEF financing of similar activities, and the paragraph spends more efforts identifying alignment with IFAD's strategy than with GEF investment criteria.

o Indirect GHG emission reductions are not accounted for, and the estimates are relatively conservative, which is the usual practice by FAO and IFAD especially in this sector.

o The impact of the global platform child project is also not accounted for with the argument that (i) country effect is fully reflected already in the country project concept notes (after checking, this is not identified/described in most of the country project estimates so far) and (ii) upscaling effects will be captured by systems transformation metrics in a qualitative manner.

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

a. No response required, but see question above about Figure 2

b. Please see response above regarding Section 2(b). Specific references to the relevant indicators from the results framework are now referred to in the M&E section

c. Response on two core indicators below:

Core Indicator 4.4

The following explanation has been added to the Concept Notes for Bhutan and Indonesia (which were the only two countries that proposed targets for Indicator 4.4):

The area targets for Core Indicator 4.4, including compliance with HCVF criteria, will be confirmed during PPG. The current targets for HCVF are based on the fact that the forests in question belong to the Indo-Malayan forest biome, which is of critical global importance. All of the forests referred to meet at least one of the following HCVF criteria:

- HCV1 Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant concentrations of biodiversity values (e.g. endemism, endangered species, refugia).
- HCV2 Forest areas containing globally, regionally or nationally significant large landscape level forests, contained within, or containing the management unit, where viable populations of most if not all naturally occurring species exist in natural patterns of distribution and abundance.
- HCV3 Forest areas that are in or contain rare, threatened or endangered ecosystems.

- HCV4 Forest areas that provide basic services of nature in critical situations (e.g. watershed protection, erosion control).
- HCV5 Forest areas fundamental to meeting basic needs of local communities (e.g. subsistence, health).
- HCV6 Forest areas critical to local communities? traditional cultural identity (areas of cultural, ecological, economic or religious significance identified in cooperation with such local communities)
- In addition, it is now explained in paragraph 176 of the PFD that ?IP investments will also contribute to the protection of High Conservation Value Forests (HCVFs)?: the specific identities and area targets for these will be defined once the limits of the target landscapes for each child project are confirmed during full project formulation?.

Core Indicator 4.5

At the concept note stage it has not been possible for project proponents to identify specific OECMs. This will however be flagged up to them as a priority to be addressed during PPG, and detailed technical guidance will be provided accordingly. This is now explained in paragraph 176 pf the PFD.

d. No response required

e. No response required

Response to Final comments

- GHG emissions outside AFOLU were included by mistake for Tanzania, Nigeria, and Eswatini. These are now included as direct emissions. Core Indicator worksheets have been corrected.

Given the short time available for preparation, it was not possible to do an in-depth assessment of GHG emissions as many times the target areas and specific activities (by area) are not known. At this stage, countries have prepared GHG emissions assessments (direct emissions) for the AFOLU sector based on the rough data available.

During PPG, FAO and IFAD will provide guidance to countries to help them prepare detailed GHG emissions assessments building on tools such as EX-ACT, NEXT, or GLEAM. This guidance will include analysis of indirect emissions. For instance, TNC?s foodscapes program could help reduce GHG emissions in some of the FSIP countries as well as other countries not targeted by FSIP (i.e. catalytic action attributable to long-term outcomes of GEF activities that remove barriers). The guidance will also include

considerations regarding GHG emissions outside AFOLU (i.e. use of renewable energy in target value chains).

- Please see response above.

- The explanatory note below the PFD core indicator table now explains that "The targets presented above represent the sum of child project targets. Through its support to country child projects, the GCP will increase the effectiveness of the country projects, and thereby contribute indirectly to their GEB delivery. Through its programmatic influence on the transformation of global food systems, and the policy, finance and institutional structures that drive them, and the consequent scaling of the models applied in the country child projects, through partners and initiatives, the IP (and particularly the GCP) will also catalyse the lasting delivery of GEBs at worldwide scale, far beyond the target geographies themselves."

- Please see response to the comment on section 6.2 below, which refers to this same issue.

- Core Indicator 6 targets will be revisited during the full formulation of country child projects; countries appear to have been conservative in their estimates at this stage, and may not fully have taken into account the impact of co-financing, or value chain emissions. The mitigation indicator section for Kenya and Ethiopia have been strengthened and will be further during PPG.

- Please see response above regarding the GCP Child.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

a. Cleared

b. Cleared

c. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

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

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

a. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

a. Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

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

Secretariat's Comments

5/16/2023 PU
Cleared

GBF alignment:

Well aligned ? the PFD clearly demonstrates how the FSIP will deliver across the various GBF targets in a very logical way. It also included alignment with the FA strategy for BD and other focal areas.

Main question and observation to them for clarification is the plan and strategy for tracking at the Program Level all the contributions to the GBF Targets not related to the GBF Targets.

We would like to know if FAO/IFAD has developed indicators and means of implementation in the Program Results Framework to capture the outputs and outcomes of child projects that can be aggregated at the Program level for the GBF targets that we cannot link up directly with GEF Core Indicators. These are many of the policy related targets, finance, etc. If we are not measuring these contributions, then it is difficult to then clearly state that we are contributing to advancing these GBF targets. These targets include GBF TARGETS: 1, 8, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 19. Please elaborate and clarify how you will address this monitoring issue?

CCM alignment: Among the avenues to increase GHG benefits, when looking at alignment with the CCM-1-4 criteria, while the PFD identifies the co-benefits requirement well, the justification of alignment with the CCM 1-4 objective is weak and limits itself to ?supporting the efficient investments to generate GHG mitigation benefits, especially in agriculture landscapes and the agriculture sector?. The paragraph spends more efforts outlining alignment with IFAD's strategy than with GEF investment criteria. This should be revised in alignment with GEF-CCM priorities, outlined below. In particular, the nature of agricultural practices or at least levers of GHG emission reductions should be identified, and cost-efficiency should be better demonstrated as for now the estimate of CCM GEBs is by several factors below what would be expected based on past iterations of this IP.

o See CCM GEF-8 Strategy: ?The Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture launched by COP 23 identified issues related to agriculture which have a potential to contribute to the mitigation of climate change: improved soil carbon, improved nutrient use and manure management towards sustainable and resilient agricultural systems, and improved livestock management systems. Following the work and results of this ongoing process under UNFCCC, the GEF will support enabling frameworks, capacity development and investment activities with clear potential to result in cost-effective and high-impact climate mitigation outcomes in the agriculture sector.?

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

- **GBF Alignment:** It is now specified that ?The co-leads will provide specific orientation to country child project formulation teams on the development and application of consistent indicators related to each of the above GBF targets, that can be aggregated across projects in order to track the cumulative impact of the IP. In parallel and building on tools such as ABC-Map, the co-leads will identify indicators at the programme level, to complement the current list of GEF Core Indicators, improve alignment with the GBF targets and help aligning the child projects.

- **CCM Alignment:** Text has been added to paragraph 182 providing additional detail on the alignment with the CCM 1-4 objective, referring to the issues identified in the Koronivia Joint Work on Agriculture.

Core Indicator 6 targets will be revisited during the full formulation of country child projects; countries appear to have been conservative in their estimates at this stage, and may not fully have taken into account the impact of co-financing, or value chain emissions.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

[Cleared](#)

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) 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):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

5/16/2023

Cleared - Kenya LoE has been delayed.

4/27/2023 PU

Child projects ID11231- Pakistan and 11237- Philippines: please change the GEF financing table and PPG table so that country STAR allocation by BD, CC, and LD match with Sources of funds table

IP childs list							Sources of funds				GEF financing table and PPG table				Differences			
Child ID	Country	Parent IP ID	Parent IP Name	BD STAR Allocation	CC STAR Allocation	LD STAR Allocation	Grand Total	Child ID	BD STAR Allocation: IPs	CC STAR Allocation: IPs	LD STAR Allocation: IPs	Grand Total	Child ID	BD STAR Allocation: IPs	CC STAR Allocation: IPs	LD STAR Allocation: IPs	Grand Total	
11217	Benin	11214	Food Systems In	2,000,000		3,000,000	5,000,000	11217	2,000,000		3,000,000	5,000,000	11217	-	-	-	-	
11231	Pakistan	11214	Food Systems In	2,500,000	1,300,000	2,000,000	5,800,000	11231	2,500,000	1,300,001	1,999,999	5,800,000	11231	-	-	(1)	1	
11221	Peru	11214	Food Systems In	9,337,500	1,662,500		11,000,000	11221	9,337,500	1,662,500		11,000,000	11221	-	-	-	-	
11237	Philippines	11214	Food Systems In	4,700,000	1,500,000	1,795,989	7,995,989	11237	4,699,999	1,500,000	1,795,990	7,995,989	11237	1	-	-	(1)	
11233	Sri Lanka	11214	Food Systems In	3,500,000		500,000	4,000,000	11233	3,500,000		500,000	4,000,000	11233	-	-	-	-	

From information we found in the Letters of Endorsement (LoEs) *vis-?-vis* the information in Portal few countries have inconsistencies. As you know, the figures in Portal can be lower than those in LoE, so there is no need to do anything on these ? but it can?t be higher (some cases are higher ? this needs to be amended). Some fields are easier to be changed in Portal (i.e., Title or Executing Entity). However, the financial information needs to be carefully reviewed considering the guidance provided by the IP Coordination Team *as well as* the figures that allow the submission to go through ? this means that consistency between what it is presented in the LoEs with those figures that allowed the submission included in the Sources of Funding is required (please carefully see Kenya, Benin, Costa Rica, Chad, China, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Philippines). Please also note that:

- Kenya ? Ex Agency title reads Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development; The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and check the BD STAR allocation
- Benin - Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
- Argentina - **Not specified**
- Burkina Faso - **Not specified**
- LoEs from India and Indonesia are missed.
- In Ethiopia and Pakistan, LoE has been signed by someone who is not in the GEF database (on the website)
- The LoE from Nigeria does not specify the Focal Area in the financing requested. We left the figures in a comment, but these are not included in the table

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

- GEF financing table for Pakistan and Philippines has been changed to match Source of funds table

- LOEs and figures in the portal have been revised in all countries to ensure consistency

- Kenya: Noted, has been revised

- Argentina: The portal matches the LOE

- LOEs from India and Indonesia have been requested

-LOE from Ethiopia has been updated. Pakistan Focal point was changed on 14 April, after the Program was submitted.

-Nigeria: New LOE obtained and data updated in the portal.

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

[N/A](#)

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

n/a

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the

authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

[11/01/2023 PU](#)

LoEs review:

LOEs from Uganda and Kazakhstan are missing.

The following LOEs have different child project name than in Portal, please correct Portal to match the LOEs: Indonesia, Tanzania, Turkiye, Nigeria

The following LOEs have different executing partner name than in Portal, please correct Portal to match the LOEs: India, Malaysia, Ecuador, Angola, Namibia, Ghana

Co-financing:

Please complete the name of co-financier and investment mobilized for these sources which are missing

GEF Agency	WB	Loans	40,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government		Public Investment	140,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government		In-kind	13,000,000.00
Donor Agency		Grant	27,000,000.00
Private Sector		Equity	20,000,000.00
GEF Agency	WB	Loans	40,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government		Public Investment	140,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government		In-kind	13,000,000.00
Donor Agency		Grant	27,000,000.00
Private Sector		Equity	20,000,000.00

Public investment is investment mobilized normally. Please request the agency to revise the ?recurrent expenditures? to ?investment mobilized? where public investment is classified as recurrent expenditures.

In-kind is ?recurrent expenditure? normally. Please request the agency to revise the ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? where recurrent expenditures is classified as investment mobilized.

5/16/2023 PU

Cleared

4/27/2023 PU

a. Cleared

b. Cleared

c. Cleared

d. Cleared

e. Cleared

f. Cleared

g. Cleared

From information we found in the Letters of Endorsement (LoEs) *vis-?-vis* the information in Portal few countries have inconsistencies. As you know, the figures in Portal can be lower than those in LoE, so there is no need to do anything on these ? but it can?t be higher (some cases are higher ? this needs to be amended). Some fields are easier to be changed in Portal (i.e., Title or Executing Entity). However, the financial information needs to be carefully reviewed considering the guidance provided by the IP Coordination Team *as well as* the figures that allow the submission to go through ? this means that consistency between what it is presented in the LoEs with those figures that allowed the submission included in the Sources of Funding is required (please carefully see Kenya, Benin, Costa Rica, Chad, China, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Philippines). Please also note that:

- Kenya ? Ex Agency title reads Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development; The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and check the BD STAR allocation
- Benin - Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
- Argentina - **Not specified**
- Burkina Faso - **Not specified**
- LoEs from India and Indonesia are missed.
- In Ethiopia and Pakistan, LoE has been signed by someone who is not in the GEF database (on the website)
- The LoE from Nigeria does not specify the Focal Area in the financing requested. We left the figures in a comment, but these are not included in the table

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

LOE Review

-As indicated above, LOE from Uganda has been included. LOE from KAZ is still pending.

-Information from the LOEs is now correctly reflected in the portal

Co-financing review

Cofinancing information has been updated both in the concept notes and the portal. Public investment is now correctly identified as "investment mobilized" and in-kind expenditures are now correctly identified as "recurrent expenditures"

10 May 2023

No response required for (a.) to (g.).

Please see above (Question 9.1) for response to other issues highlighted.

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

[5/16/2023 PU](#)

Cleared

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

[LoEs from India and Indonesia are missed.](#)

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

See spreadsheet

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

See spreadsheet

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/16/2023

Cleared

Please provide the information in the ?investment mobilized? blank field below:

Private Sector	Peru FS IP - Asociacion Industrial, Michell Factory, Inca Group, Gloria Group	In-kind		200,000.00
----------------	---	---------	--	------------

- In-kind is normally classified as ?recurrent expenditure?. Please request the agency to revise the below which are classified as ?investment mobilized? and change them to ?recurrent expenditures.

GEF Agency	Burkina Faso FS IP -IUCN	In-kind	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Burkina Faso FS IP -Ministry in charge of Health	In-kind	Investment mobilized	7,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Burkina Faso FS IP -Local Government	In-kind	Investment mobilized	5,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Burkina Faso FS IP -Research Institute	In-kind	Investment mobilized	500,000.00
Others	Burkina Faso FS IP -Civil Society	In-kind	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00

Private Sector	Burkina Faso FS IP -Inputs and agropastoral extension providers	In-kind	Investment mobilized	500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Indonesia FS IP - Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	10,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Indonesia FS IP - National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	15,000,000.00
GEF Agency	Indonesia FS IP - FAO	In-kind	Investment mobilized	2,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Indonesia FS IP - Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	10,000,000.00

- Public investment is normally classified as 'investment mobilized'. Please request the agency to revise the below which are classified as 'recurrent expenditures' and change them to 'investment mobilized'.

Recipient Country Government	Indonesia FS IP - National Research and Innovation Agency (BRIN)	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	15,000,000.00
GEF Agency	Indonesia FS IP - FAO	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	18,000,000.00

- Grant is normally classified as 'investment mobilized'. Please request the agency to revise the below which are classified as 'recurrent expenditures' and change them to 'investment mobilized'.

Recipient Country Government	Nigeria FS IP - Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	8,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Nigeria FS IP - Government of Niger and Kebbi States	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	10,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Nigeria FS IP - Upper Niger and Sokoto-Rima Basin Authorities	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	5,000,000.00

- Please provide the 'type of co-financier' and 'investment mobilized' for the fields in below.

Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - Andhra Pradesh State Aquaculture Development Authority (APSADA)	3,900,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - Blue Revolution – Pradhan Mantri Matsya Sampada Yojana (PMMSY): Central Govt. contribution	23,410,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - Blue Revolution (PMMSY): AP State matching funds	17,480,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - Blue Revolution (PMMSY): Parasivanipalem Aqua park construction, Nizamapatnam Mandal, Bapatla District, AP	12,180,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - Concessional power tariff to aquaculture farms, Energy department, Government of AP	146,920,000.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - National Fishery Development Board (NFDB) support for certification of hatcheries, fish farms and fish feed mills in AP	205,200.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - National Fisheries Development Board(NFDB) support to farm improvement and services	18,623,457.00
Recipient Country Government	India FS IP - Other AP state funds for aquaculture related activities (e.g. infrastructure)	1,480,000.00

- Please provide the ?type of co-financier? in the blank fields below.

Recipient Country Government	Pakistan FS IP - National and Provincial Government of Pakistan	Recurrent expenditures	10,000,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Pakistan FS IP - Province of Sindh (World Bank project)	Investment mobilized	15,000,000.00
Donor Agency	Pakistan FS IP - GCF Transforming the Indus Basin with Climate Resilient Agriculture and Water Management	Investment mobilized	2,500,000.00

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

Noted. Table on co-financiers has been updated

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child 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's Comments

[5/16/2023 PU](#)

Cleared

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

[See spreadsheet.](#)

LoEs from India and Indonesia are missed.

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

Noted. New letters have been requested

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

Secretariat's Comments

[4/27/2023 PU](#)

[See spreadsheet.](#)

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

Figures in the portal have been updated as per new letters of endorsement

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2023 PU

See spreadsheet.

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

No response required

10 May 2023

Figures in the portal have been updated as per new letters of endorsement

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments

4/26/2023 PU

Cleared

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/26/2023 PU

N/A

Agency's Comments

10 May 2023

No response required

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

11/21/2023

This PFD is technically cleared

11/01/2023 PU

Not technically cleared - need to address few issues.

4/26/2023 PU

Not technically cleared - need to address few issues. Overall, the quality of the PFD is outstanding.

This is a really well done PFD. It is right up there with ASL in terms of the quality of the intellectual rationale and justification of the approach - it is very well argued and presented. Great effort in demonstrating the so-called transformation hypothesis of the entire endeavor. This element of transformation was very strong.

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

Noted. A revised version of the PFD and Concept Notes have been uploaded for your consideration.

10 May 2023

Thank you for your comments. We have addressed the comments above. As of this date, 5 revised LoE are pending (Indonesia, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Benin and Kenya) but the numbers have been agreed with the OFPs. Missing LoE will be uploaded as we receive them.

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

11/01/2023

Please address few issues and upload missing documents (LOEs, GCP CP, etc.)

5/18/2023

Missing LOE from Kenya uploaded

5/17/2023 PU - 4:30pm

All PPOs comments cleared/corrected. Only Kenya LOE submission is delayed.

5/17/2023 PU

- Please address PPO's comments on LOEs, EAs, Private sector and matching STAR amounts

- Please also add "Critical Forest Biomes IP" among those to build synergy with.

- Understand that CI6 for Burkina Faso and Chad are lower - Please consider reviewing these using EXACT at the next stage

5/16/2023 PU

Cleared

Two country projects (Ethiopia and Kenya) are at this stage focused on adaptation practices, as outlined in their justification provided under the core indicator calculation section, with references to activities related to water management or energy efficiency, which does not qualify under a Nature Based Solution with high mitigation potential (nor to be qualified as cost-effective). These activities, and related theory of change and project components as appropriate would benefit from a revision.

Agency's Comments

10 Nov 2023

Noted. All portal issues raised have been addressed. Only pending issue is the LOE from Kazakhstan

May 2023

Noted. This will be revised during project preparation.

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/27/2023	5/11/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/1/2023	