

Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program Addendum

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10397

Countries

Global (Brazil, India, Nigeria, Paraguay, Uganda)

Project Name

Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program Addendum

Agenices

World Bank, UNEP, FAO

Date received by PM

10/11/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Paul Hartman

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

WB Responses to comments from 11/4/2019:

1- PFD review: PFD Addendum -- The PFD has been restructured to better reflect the contribution of the 5 additional countries to the FOLUR program. However, the narrative on the Brazil project is lacking in detail. A better description should be provided on the challenges in the beef and soy sectors as well as the project's approach and it's efficacy in addressing these challenges through engagement not only at the national level but through participation of important leaders in the Cerrado State governments and with supportive private sector actors.

The indicators have been revised and the GHG contribution to the program of the additional countries has increased to better align with the investment. We encourage the revision of indicator 9 on chemicals of global concern and their waste during the PPG phase.

Response: Narrative has been revised to better reflect the project approach in Brazil.

The indicators will be revisited for adjustment when final child project projects documents are ready following preparatory phase and indicating any subsequent change.

2- Child concepts Review: Responses provided are sufficient. Please address the below comments during the PPG phase.

Response: Noted comments and respective child project teams have been informed for consideration during PPG. Revised LoE for India is now available and attached to the submission.

WB Responses to comments from 10/22/2019: Provided in this section as the portal does provide a response box for entries.

1- PFD review:

- **In Table B,** there is additional GEF funding indicated in the budget line of Component 4: “Program Coordination, Collaboration and Capacity Building”. We understand these funds to be coming from the country concepts and not as additional GEF funds for the Global Platform Child Project. However, in order to avoid any confusion, we suggest additional language is added to the ‘addendum context’ paragraph that states that the structure and component descriptions of the addendum are identical to that of the approved PFD and that no additional financing above what has been approved is being directed to the Global Platform Child Project.

Response: This addendum does not include a request for additional funding for the Coordination child project. Context has been better clarified.

- **In Table C,** there are 3 instances of investment mobilized described as ‘in kind’ for \$131 million, including \$91 million from private sector. Please indicate what is included and ensure it meets the categorization of investment mobilized. Note that investment mobilized is a type of Co-Financing that generally excludes recurrent expenditures. Please justify or revise to classify these as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)

- In the "Name of Co-Financier" field, please provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated.

Response: Revisions as relevant have been made. Details of the sources and types of cofinancing are reported based on potential type defined by the Child projects.

- **In Table D**, the break-down between LD and BD for India differs with OFP's endorsement letter. Either the amounts in Table D need to be adjusted to match the amounts in the Letter of Endorsement or the Agency needs to get a new Letter of Endorsement.

Response: Noted. Revised LoE will be provided.

- In the Core Indicators table, for **Indicator 3** all the restoration in the table is for agricultural land. There doesn't appear to be any restored forest land, which doesn't reflect what is in the child concepts. Please revise accordingly.

Response: It is important to clarify that as was done in the PFD first phase, the PFD level aggregate is based on the collation core indicators reported under the child projects (Table F). As per earlier agreement and in the first phase, aggregation was not done at the sub indicator level - as these are expected to be refined during PPG. For the same reason, as was done in the previous PFD submission, summaries of child project concepts are submitted which do not include the Core indicator sheets in the official submission.

- The SLM indicator is not completed in the uploaded version of the core indicator worksheet (Annex B), but it is completed in the portal version.

Response: As clarified above sub-indicator level aggregation is not included. Core indicator 3 (land restored) is reported. Portal and core indicator worksheet are aligned.

- For **Indicator 6** on GHG emissions mitigated should be under the core indicator 6.1 (AFOLU), not 6.2. It is, however, correctly categorized in the Core Indicator Worksheet.

Response: Entry Revised. At the time of submission portal glitch did not allow for revision to entries in assigned boxes.

- 20 years should be considered for the estimation of the GHG emissions mitigated (and not 7).

Response: Noted and revised.

- GHG results should be informed by each country but overall the estimate appears low given the GEF and Co-financing investments.

Response: The PFD addendum indeed reflects the aggregate of child project GHG estimates. In this early concept stage, as per earlier guidance agencies have provided realistic estimates based on data available so far in the target areas selected. Upward revisions have been made based on revised concept notes. However, these are expected to be readjusted as relevant following PPG phase of the projects.

-For **indicator 9**, an explanation is provided on how the indicator total was estimated that isn't reflect in the overall metric tons roll up, which is zero. The estimated target for reductions in use of chemical inputs is reported under sub-indicator 9.5 and should be included under 9.1 with all other sub-indicators currently blank.

Response: Revised entry. At the time of submission, portal glitch did not allow for revision of entries in the indicator boxes.

- In **Annex A**, the list of child projects doesn't indicate which Agency is responsible for which child projects. Please include

Response: Agency information included. Portal Glitch at time of submission.

-For the sub-headings list in **1a "Program Description"** and sections 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 of the Part II of the addendum, please refrain from writing "Not Applicable." Instead input something along the lines of "Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD."

Response: This was done as per earlier GEF recommendations in the guidelines provided. Revised again as per request.

-**Part II Program Description** includes a lot of narrative drawn from the approved PFD that is additional to what is required for the addendum. The length and scope of the section may give the impression that this is an entirely new PFD. The section should be simplified, streamlined, and focused on the five new countries, highlighting their importance and what they bring to the program. Aspects of the section on scaling (i.e. 'Country Projects offer good opportunities for learning and potential for scaling-up...') could be integrated into the earlier description of the five countries and their importance, while other parts identical to the approved PFD deleted. It would also be clearer if only the names of countries newly added to the PFD through the addendum are bolded for emphasis, and not previously approved countries or commodities.

- Please correct the spelling of Colombia throughout.

- For the paragraph on **palm oil**, information could be included on how Nigeria is a signatory of APOI along with Liberia.

- For the paragraph on **rice**, please indicate in the first sentence that India is a new country being added.

- For the paragraph on **cocoa**, more information should be included on the global and regional importance of Nigeria.

- For the paragraph on **coffee**, please include the word "previous" before "inclusion of Indonesia, Ethiopia ..."

-For the next paragraph on **wheat**, more information should be included on the global importance of India.

Response: Overall country and commodity contexts for the new countries have been refined to focus only on their additional added value. The context for previous phase countries has been removed as per recommendation. This was initially done to allow for clean and easy integration of the addendum text with the original PFD.

- The 1b. Program Map and Coordinates should include a revised map based that expands on the one included with the original PFD. This map should show countries and commodities, not agency logos.

Response: As discussed bilaterally, revised map without logos has been included. Noting that the earlier PFD in the GEF portal includes map with agency logos.

- In section 4. “Private sector engagement,” please include any new collaboration of significance from the five additional country projects. This should recognize that very little reference was made to soy companies or relevant soy platforms in the original PFD.

Response: Addendum context (Part II section 2) captures the elements of private sector engagement for the new child projects.

- In section 7 “Consistency with National Priorities,” please include relevant information drawn from the concepts of the newly recommended countries, particularly as examples of FOLUR Countries’ national plans, strategies and commitments as done in the original PFD.

Response: Addendum context (Part II section 3) captures the alignment of the new countries’ national priorities with the overall FOLUR objectives.

2- Child concepts Review:

Response: In general, the Child projects have been revised to take into account the comments provided. However, given the early pre-concept stage, some comments have been taken note of for reconfirmation/addressal during the preparatory phase. See also attached child project agency responses to specific GEF comments.

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/22/2019

No the PFD addendum is not recommended for technical clearance. Please address comments and questions below:

1- PFD review:

- **In Table B**, there is additional GEF funding indicated in the budget line of Component 4: “Program Coordination, Collaboration and Capacity Building”. We understand these funds to be coming from the country concepts and not as additional GEF funds for the Global Platform Child Project. However, in order to avoid any confusion, we suggest additional language is added to the ‘addendum context’ paragraph that states that the structure and component descriptions of the addendum are identical to that of the approved PFD and that no additional financing above what has been approved is being directed to the Global Platform Child Project.

- **In Table C**, there are 3 instances of investment mobilized described as ‘in kind’ for \$131 million, including \$91 million from private sector. Please indicate what is included and ensure it meets the categorization of investment mobilized. Note that investment mobilized is a type of Co-Financing that generally excludes recurrent expenditures. Please justify or revise to classify these as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)

- In the "Name of Co-Financier" field, please provide the name of the entity that provides the co-financing, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated.

- **In Table D**, the break-down between LD and BD for India differs with OFP’s endorsement letter. Either the amounts in Table D need to be adjusted to match the amounts in the Letter of Endorsement or the Agency needs to get a new Letter of Endorsement.

- In the Core Indicators table, for **Indicator 3** all the restoration in the table is for agricultural land. There doesn’t appear to be any restored forest land, which doesn’t reflect what is in the child concepts. Please revise accordingly.

- The SLM indicator is not completed in the uploaded version of the core indicator worksheet (Annex B), but it is completed in the portal version.

- For **Indicator 6** on GHG emissions mitigated should be under the core indicator 6.1 (AFOLU), not 6.2. It is, however, correctly categorized in the Core Indicator Worksheet.

- 20 years should be considered for the estimation of the GHG emissions mitigated (and not 7).

- GHG results should be informed by each country but overall the estimate appears low given the GEF and Co-financing investments.

- **For indicator 9**, an explanation is provided on how the indicator total was estimated that isn’t reflect in the overall metric tons roll up, which is zero. The estimated target for reductions in use of chemical inputs is reported under sub-indicator 9.5 and should be included under 9.1 with all other sub-indicators currently blank.

- In **Annex A**, the list of child projects doesn’t indicate which Agency is responsible for which child projects. Please include

-For the sub-headings list in **1a “Program Description”** and sections 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 of the Part II of the addendum, please refrain from writing “Not Applicable.” Instead input something along the lines of “Consistent with the narrative description of the approved PFD.”

-**Part II Program Description** includes a lot of narrative drawn from the approved PFD that is additional to what is required for the addendum. The length and scope of the section may give the impression that this is an entirely new PFD. The section should be simplified, streamlined, and focused on the five new countries, highlighting their importance and what they bring to the program. Aspects of the section on scaling (i.e. ‘Country Projects offer good opportunities for learning and potential for scaling-up...’) could be integrated into the earlier description of the five countries and their importance, while other parts identical to the approved PFD deleted. It would also be clearer if only the names of countries newly added to the PFD through the addendum are bolded for emphasis, and not previously approved countries or commodities.

- Please correct the spelling of Colombia throughout.

- For the paragraph on **palm oil**, information could be included on how Nigeria is a signatory of APOI along with Liberia.

- For the paragraph on **rice**, please indicate in the first sentence that India is a new country being added.

- For the paragraph on **cocoa**, more information should be included on the global and regional importance of Nigeria.

- For the paragraph on **coffee**, please include the word “previous” before “inclusion of Indonesia, Ethiopia ...”

-For the next paragraph on **wheat**, more information should be included on the global importance of India.

- The 1b. Program Map and Coordinates should include a revised map based that expands on the one included with the original PFD. This map should show countries and commodities, not agency logos.

- In section 4. “Private sector engagement,” please include any new collaboration of significance from the five additional country projects. This should recognize that very little reference was made to soy companies or relevant soy platforms in the original PFD.

- In section 7 “Consistency with National Priorities,” please include relevant information drawn from the concepts of the newly recommended countries, particularly as examples of FOLUR Countries’ national plans, strategies and commitments as done in the original PFD.

2- Child concepts Review:

Brazil – IBRD, Beef and Soy:

- The concept has been strengthened from the EoI with a much greater amount of detail.
- The general description of the 3 areas where the project will focus is sound, but the total land area described is massive. In the description of the 9 selected landscapes found in table 1, it would be clarifying to know the size of these more targeted landscapes (and names of the municipalities involved) in order to determine whether the resources of the project and co-financing are aligned with the proposed outcomes. The case should also be strengthened about how these landscapes provide strong justification for allocation of resources to support biodiversity and improve productivity.
- It would be helpful to know the forest cover and deforestation rate in the 3 selected areas
- In the Baseline, the concept could also mention the restoration of 22 million hectares pledged under the Initiative 20x20, which seems relevant.
- The work of the GEF-6 Good Growth Program work in MATOPIBA is also missing from the baseline. It will be important for the FOLUR project to build on the field work of this project to the extent possible as some of the proposed activities around ABC loans and compliance with the Forest Code are quite similar. Moreover, some of the financing and demand interventions of this project may also be relevant.
- It is unclear how the high adoption of no-tillage techniques for soy production is an opportunity for the project to progress crop-livestock-forest integration (ILPF), certification and traceability within the supply chain.
- The importance of engagement with private sector has been improved, however, more specificity of targets for engagement would be helpful as large sections of the private sector that are investing into the region are missing. Brands and retailers that could support connectivity with the full value chain are currently absent in the typology list of Table 2 and should be included. Input providers that are the means by which the biggest productivity gains can be made could also be incorporated as private sector partners. Financing entities (eg. Agri 3 and the Mirova LDN funds) could be assessed for their interest in supporting and co-financing initiatives to restore land and promoting sustainable practices, etc. Please revise accordingly
- For the use of harmonized tools for traceability, please strengthen the case that traceability in these regions is an issue and that data will be available.
- The concept states that the interventions will contribute to the management of waste and chemical pollution. The estimated benefit of this should be quantified in the core indicator table if possible.
- The direct beneficiaries are not very clear and their profile should be more detailed.
- There are no specific mentions of NGOs and Indigenous peoples in the Stakeholder listing.
- It is unclear what infrastructure interventions and off-farm investments the project will support. The concept should provide more specific information on this.

- Project management shouldn't be part of a Component 4 as it is supported by the PMC. This section should be more related to KM and outreach, such as identification and dissemination of lessons learned.
- Core Indicator Worksheet: the kind of land restored should be indicated (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and/or 3.4).
- The GHG emissions mitigated should be calculated over a period of 20 years unless a good justification is provided.
- Number of direct beneficiaries: why is the number of female beneficiaries so much less than the number of men? The description says that the project will encourage the equitable gender participation. An explanation is needed in the concept.

India – FAO, Rice and Wheat:

- The country context description should move beyond the statement of significant environmental footprints (without any reference to deforestation).
- The engagement with the private sector and relevant stakeholder platforms is unclear (only a reference is made to Ad Hoc Technical Experts Group-Farmers' Rights). More emphasis is needed on the other actors in the value chain such as financiers/bankers and the how the project intends to positively influence the entire value chain for rice and wheat, by ensuring that these actors trained and know how to develop and implement n sustainable financing mechanisms
- Access to sustainable finance, development of financing mechanisms and the issue of incentives that promote unsustainable practices is not adequately covered in the project description
- There is no mention of land tenure issues that the project may have to address and how it will do so.
- The Component 3 description would benefit from more details.
- In the table "Project components and financing", the kind of GEF support is only TA for the components 1 and 2 and the other components are not indicated. There should be some investments indicated as well.
- The results of direct GHG emissions mitigated and area of land restored appear relatively low. What are the assumptions behind these numbers?
- The result of the area of land restored is different in the text and in the Core Indicator Worksheet. Please adjust accordingly.

Nigeria – FAO, Cocoa and Palm Oil:

- In the description of the country context, it is not clear why environmental degradation and, notably, the deforestation rate remain so high despite the political will and commitments. What are the existing barriers the project has to address to be successful?

- The definition and extension of the targeted landscapes is not clear (they are “found within 2 states”). The proposal should clearly define the limits of the landscapes, be they geographical or administrative.
- A further elaboration of the Theory of Change would be helpful.
- Component 1: the project will support the development and institutionalization of already existing plans that have not yet been developed or implemented. It is unclear whether these plans are fully aligned with the FOLUR strategy and objectives and whether the project will support the entire development and institutionalization of these plans. In particular, what stakeholders are involved in these plans and how they are integrated. In addition, the mechanisms for upscaling of the project to influence and transform the production and value chain agenda at the national level and in other cocoa and palm oil producing areas should be further considered.
- Component 2: There should be more consideration of other actors in the value chain such as financiers/bankers and the how the project intends to positively influence the entire value chain for coca and palm oil by ensuring that these actors are trained and know how to develop and implement sustainable financing mechanisms. With regard to the training for the access to financial services, please make clear why the focus on this is unique to the needs of women.
- Component 3: Please make clear that the restoration work discussed is focused on ensuring eco-system services provision to productive landscapes and not more general restoration of natural vegetation or afforestation. In addition to restoration, it is stated that the project will also fund conservation activities. What are these activities and where will they be implemented? Please note that the project shouldn't explicitly support activities related to protected areas management. Any focus on conservation should place more emphasis on reducing biodiversity loss and restoration of productive landscapes, HCVF identification and management, etc, and/or reducing the effects on ecosystem services in productive landscapes. The impact of these initiatives on the management of protected areas or species can, however, be a project focus.
- Incremental reasoning: the project will support the implementation of REDD+ with activities such as “strengthening the capacity of REDD+ committees”. The added value of the FOLUR project and its complementarity with the national REDD+ strategy needs to be more clearly described.
- Ensure consistency of information on the link to the global coordination project, in particular in component 4.
- There is mention of a creating a regional hub with other producers (Ghana and Cote d' Ivoire), which would be linked to the global coordination project. This is encouraged but please ensure that this is coordinated with the other projects in the ppg phase and reflected in each of the child projects

Paraguay – UNEP, Beef and Soy

- The project tables don't indicate any executing partners despite the list of potential government and NGO partners detailed in the EoI. Without partners specified to undertake activities at the field sites it becomes unclear how the project will be carried out. Please ensure that the names of such potential partners are included.

- The concept states that the deforestation rate remains high despite the political will described through enactment of several laws that are thus not properly respected and enforced. Beyond the needed institutional coordination that is addressed by the project, the proposal should better demonstrate how the proposed activities will take on this issue. For instance, are incentive instruments being considered to change the behavior?
- Please spell out the full text for the “STP” and “BAP” acronyms at least once in the document.
- Baseline: The participation of Paraguay in the GEF-6 Good Growth Partnership should be further elaborated. How the financing work of this project will be carried forward is discussed later in the concept but there is no reference to how the production and demand work will be built upon. In addition, the concept should be more explicit about the multiple stakeholder engagement “building on their ongoing efforts”. What the project will do for inclusion and gender should be moved from the baseline section.
- In component 1, as written, it appears that the primary focus of capacity building, planning and convening activities will be at the national level but it is unclear how this will translate to relevant project outcomes as the description of their link to the productive landscapes is weak. Any capacity building activities that are included should demonstrate direct relevance to the generation of GEB at the landscape level. Moreover, it is stated that the land use plans will be developed with national investments and co-financing while the GEF increment will support the gender sensitive integration of good governance. Gender consideration is indeed very important, but it should not appear as a targeted key incremental intervention. Please revise.
- In component 3, the project shouldn't explicitly target activities related to protected areas management as FOLUR projects are focused on productive landscapes. As written, the activities are not aligned with the FOLUR Program design and therefore not acceptable. Any focus on Conservation should place more emphasis on reducing biodiversity loss and restoration of productive landscapes, HCVF identification and management, etc, and/or reducing the effects on ecosystem services in productive landscapes. The impact of these initiatives on the management of protected areas or species can, however, be a project focus. Please adjust accordingly.
- The 2 paragraphs describing the Chaco and Atlantic Forest are repeated in the concept.
- The proposal is not clear regarding the beneficiaries and targeted stakeholders (profiles, company names, etc). These targets should be clearly identified.
- The engagement with the Global/Regional framework is unclear and should be further detailed. As described, it is very generic and paragraph 2 to 4 are not responding to the question. The description of private sector engagement outside of the financing sector is also in need of further elaboration.
- In the table “Project components and financing”, the kind of GEF support is only TA. There should be some investments included.
- Core Indicator Worksheet: the kind of land restored should also be indicated (3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and/or 3.4).
- Core Indicator Worksheet: the kind of area under improved practices should also be indicated (4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and/or 4.4).

Uganda – UNEP, Coffee and staple crops

-- The project tables list NEMA as the lead agency, which is incorrect. This should be UNEP with NEMA as an executing partner. No other executing partners are detailed despite the list of potential government and NGO partners detailed in the EoI. Please ensure that potential partners are listed.

- The context needs to be improved to indicate why the country and target landscape are globally important for the commodity of focus, and how this fits into the global value chain. The global environmental importance (biodiversity, forest type, GHG storage) should also be further described.

- National positioning and commitments are not clearly described, especially regarding the sustainability goal, and don't include value chains targeted by the project -- for example there is nothing about coffee. What is already in place to help the project achieve its objectives should be better described.

- As written, it is difficult to understand the Theory of Change of this project. Clarifications should also be provided on how the project aligns with the broader Theory of Change of the FOLUR program in the PFD.

- The project mentions the lack of integrated landscape management system with a strong governance framework but the proposed explanation of the project's integrated approach doesn't clearly address this issue. How will the project components be integrated in the landscape? What is the country's current position on integrated land use planning and how is the project building on what already exists to transform the system at the national level? How will the landscape planning at the site level then be upscaled to the national level?

- GEF resources will also be used to achieve sustainable land management practices for staple crops. Will a significant proportion of the budget will be used for staple crops? The project's primary entry point and focus should be on deforestation-free coffee as a key commodity. Please adjust

- In the incremental reasoning section how will "support of deforestation-free commodities" be undertaken.

- The description of the components is very general. More details on the activities to be supported should be provided.

- Any focus on Conservation should place more emphasis on reducing biodiversity loss and restoration of productive landscapes, HCVF identification and management, etc, and/or reducing the effects on ecosystem services in productive landscapes.

- Land tenure not mentioned as an intervention to be addressed. Please do so if this is a significant barrier.

- Establishing a specific partnership among the 5 countries that applied for the 2nd FOLUR call for proposals is likely not the most effective means to scale results. Instead it would be better to consider projects focused on similar commodities in the region as a starting point for scaling. Moreover, the impact program is not focused on 'food security' as indicated in the text. Please correct this.

- In the table "Project components and financing," GEF support only comes as TA. There should be some investments as well. The type of GEF support for component 4 should also be indicated.

11/04/19

No the PFD addendum is not recommended for technical clearance. Please address the remaining comment below:

1- PFD review:

PFD Addendum -- The PFD has been restructured to better reflect the contribution of the 5 additional countries to the FOLUR program. However, the narrative on the Brazil project is lacking in detail. A better description should be provided on the challenges in the beef and soy sectors as well as the project's approach and its efficacy in addressing these challenges through engagement not only at the national level but through participation of important leaders in the Cerrado State governments and with supportive private sector actors.

The indicators have been revised and the GHG contribution to the program of the additional countries has increased to better align with the investment. We encourage the revision of indicator 9 on chemicals of global concern and their waste during the PPG phase.

2- Child concepts Review: Responses provided are sufficient. Please address the below comments during the PPG phase.

Brazil- Responses are adequate, additional comments are below.

- The project might be better supported by various stakeholders if some of the major business groups working throughout the Cerrado are directly involved. During the PPG phase, please work to engage such groups.
- The case for the biodiversity values of the selected landscapes should be strengthened during the PPG period.
- The concept states in the that the main beneficiaries of the project are rural producers with small to medium sized farms (production area between 4 and 70 fiscal units), their associations and communities who benefit from the landscape's natural resources. But it is also written that “family farms (78% of farms) occupy only 14.7% of the total productive area; while the remaining 22% midsize and large farms occupy 85.3% of the productive area.” It would therefor appear that small-medium farmers are not the bulk of agricultural land use as compared to midsize and large farms. During the PPG phase it will important to develop a clear rationale for the targeting of small-medium farmers in areas where they appear to play a less of a role in production.
- While the efforts to dispose safely of agrochemicals is certainly important, it perhaps should be a secondary focus of the efforts at the landscape level, as opposed to a ‘major premise of the Project’ as is stated in the concept. Please ensure that this balance of initiatives is reflected in the CEO endorsement.
- We understand that discussions are on-going with the GEF Good Growth Partnership and would expect that mention of the program will be added to the baseline of the CEO Endorsement and that project efforts will build upon this GEF-6 investment.

- While the five outputs identified in the last paragraph of section C contribute to the Global Environmental Benefits, they are not all what GEF considers GEBs themselves (except for GHG emissions mitigated). Please better reflect BD, LD, CC and CW GEBs in the CEO Endorsement.

- During the PPG please indicate how the project will help to meet Brazil's LDN targets if finalized. If not finalized, explain how this project can contribute to that process.

India- Responses are adequate, please see additional comments below.

- During the PPG please indicate how the project will help to meet India's LDN targets if finalized. If not finalized, how can this project can contribute to that process.

Nigeria- Responses are adequate additional comments are below.

- During the PPG please indicate how the project will help to meet Nigeria's LDN targets if finalized. If not finalized, explain how this project can contribute to that process.

Paraguay- Responses are adequate, additional comments are below.

-- At the start of the PPG phase we would like to engage in a discussion with the project proponents to ensure that the institutional arrangement of the project is sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes. In particular, we would like to better understand how the executing agency that has been selected, ICCF, which is a conservation organization not currently operating in Paraguay, is equipped with the capacity to directly carry out activities to improve management of productive landscapes (e.g. improved agriculture practice with cattle ranchers and soy farmers, HCVF identification and management, spatial planning, policy development, etc) without any significant delay, or if an alternative/complementary execution arrangement is needed to ensure that all aspects of the project are well executed and are delivering on the ambitious outcomes.

- With reference to component 3 of the project, we will want the agency to ensure that the CEO endorsement conveys a clear understanding of the role of restoration in the project that aligns with the function that was intended for restoration in the FOLUR program. Restoration activities should focus on degraded agricultural and forest areas where reforested areas will strengthen provision of ecosystem services (e.g. protection of soils and water supplies) to productive landscapes. Improving connectivity of priority national parks should be pursued only if outcomes can be shown to directly contribute to delivery of ecosystem services to the production landscapes targeted for improved management by the project, and to the protection of biodiversity in the productive landscapes and adjacent protected area. Similarly, implementing alternative income schemes for communities around parks to reduce pressure on these parks should be pursued only if communities are part of a targeted production landscape and the community members are engaged in production of agricultural commodities (i.e. soy or beef) that are a significant deforestation threat to the surrounding national parks.

- During the PPG please indicate how the project will help to meet Paraguay's LDN targets if finalized. If not finalized, explain how this project can contribute to that process.

Uganda- Responses are adequate, additional comments are below.

-The concept still does not clarify the importance of the targeted landscape for coffee. How much of the 500,000ha of agricultural land in the targeted landscape is used for coffee versus the other staple crops and then what portion of this represents the national production levels. This should be detailed at the PPG stage.

- With reference to component 3 of the project, we will want the agency to ensure that the CEO endorsement conveys a clear understanding of the role of restoration in the project that aligns with the function that was intended for restoration in the FOLUR program. Restoration activities should focus on degraded agricultural and forest areas where reforested areas will strengthen provision of ecosystem services (e.g. protection of soils and water supplies) to productive landscapes. Improving connectivity of priority national parks should be pursued only if outcomes can be shown to directly contribute to delivery of ecosystem services to the production landscapes targeted for improved management by the project, and to the protection of biodiversity in the productive landscapes and adjacent protected area.

- There is now good description of potential regional efforts at scaling in section 2d Component 4, but still little reference to the global coordination project. At PPG, please ensure there is an adequate description of how component 4 will link to the global coordination project.

-During the PPG please indicate how the project will help to meet Uganda's LDN targets if finalized. If not finalized, explain how this project can contribute to that process.

11/11/19

Yes, the PFD is being recommended for technical clearance. All comments and questions have been sufficiently addressed or will be considered in the PPG phase.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please ensure that comments on the PFD and country concepts that were indicated as things that will be addressed in the PPG phase are then reflected as updates or revisions in the CEO Endorsement documents.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		