



Sustainable Wool and Mohair Value chain Competitiveness project (WaMCoP)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11210

Countries

Lesotho

Project Name

Sustainable Wool and Mohair Value chain Competitiveness project (WaMCoP)

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

4/13/2023

Review completed by PM

10/25/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b)

b.1. Please complete "AFOLU" for "Project Sector (CCM Only):".

b.2. The duration of 84 months is relatively long as compared to other GEF project. Is there a particular justification for that? Please clarify.

May 15, 2023:

b) Thank you for the amendment and justification. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 May 2023

B.1 ??AFOLU?? was added to ??Project Sector (CCM Only)??

b2. 84 months aligns to the baseline investment and has been informed by the past experience in project implementation in Lesotho. Moreover, there has been a desire from the Government of Lesotho to have longer, more impactful projects that transcend short-term cycles.

Therefore, in honouring this request, WaMCoP-GEF has been designed as a programmatic intervention that extends for 84 months, which will provide ample time for learnings, more investment and greater impact.

2. Project Summary

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

1. No, the "summary" exceeds by far the limit of 250 words. Please provide a shorter summary with a number of words up to 250 including all the following elements: (i) the problem and issues to be addressed (ii) the project objectives, and if the project is intended to be transformative, how will this be achieved? iii), the approach to deliver on objectives, and (iv) the GEBs and other key expected results.

2. The WaMCoP project is said to be co-funded by the Government of Lebanon. Lebanon doesn't appear in the list of cofinanciers. Please confirm the WaMCoP project is co-funded by the Government of Lebanon.

May 15, 2023:

1. The summary refers to South Africa's input and service while the project is in Lesotho. Please correct.

1bis. Please add the expected result in terms of GHG emission mitigated (5 Mt CO₂e).

2. Thank you for the improvement and correction. Cleared.

June 9, 2023:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2023

1. Reference to South Africa has been omitted

2.

1.b. GHG emissions mitigated have been added: 5 060 149 tCO₂-eq

12 May 2023

1. The summary has been shortened to less 250 words.

2. WaMCoP is co-funded by the Government of Lesotho and not the Government of Lebanon. The error has been corrected.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a) Yes, cleared.

b)

b.1. The outcome 1.2 as formulated "Improved rangeland management...through Responsible wool and mohair production", doesn't reflect the outputs (biodiversity focus is missing) and looks more aligned with component 2 (improved management, production). Please clarify the formulation of the outcome 1.2.

b.2. the output 1.3.2 is titled "Financing and market incentive systems developed **for** (PES- gradual payment, initial investment, potential co-finance from private sector and finance etc.)". What "for" means? Please check the formulation.

b.3. Aren't the output 2.1.1 "Rangeland management ... plan, developed and implemented" redundant with the output 2.2.1 "Strengthened adoption of environmentally sustainable rangeland-management practices..."? As formulated, both are about the implementation of improved practices on the ground. The outcome 2.2 and the output 2.2.1 should maybe more explicitly focus on the development and adoption of incentive models. Please clarify.

b.4. The GEBs associated with the Biodiversity focal area are represented by Core Indicators 3 (Area of land restored) and 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices, excluding protected areas), with targets of 150,000 ha and 7,000 ha, respectively. The indicator stated for forest cover Component 2 "Conversion of 33,900 Ha of bushland into rangeland achieved; zero conversion of forests achieved; 150 000ha of land restored and forest cover increased by 15,331 Ha?", is not reflected in the proposed core indicators. Please explain and adjust.

b.5. Isn't the output 3.2.2 "Project gender disaggregated M&E system developed" redundant with the output 1 of the M&E component "System for project monitoring and evaluation designed"? Please clarify.

May 15, 2023:

b1. The name of the outcome 1.2 is different in the Project overview table and in the component description. Please ensure the name of all the outcomes are consistent throughout the project description.

b2, b.3, b.4 and b.5. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

June 9, 2023:

b1. No, the name of the outcome 1.2 is still different in the Project overview table and in the component description. Please correct to have consistent formulation throughout the project description.

July 28, 2023:

b1. Not addressed but this kind of detail is not crucial and can be fixed during PPG phase. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 September 2023

noted thank you

June 23, 2023: Checked for consistency and corrected

26 May 2023

The names for all the outcomes have been checked for consistent throughout the project description.

12 May 2023

b1. The outcome has been reformulated to include biodiversity as follows ? ??Improved carbon accounting system and biodiversity monitoring through Responsible[1]1 wool and mohair production??

b2. The word ??for?? is redundant. This was omitted.

b3. Suggestion incorporated. Output 2.1.1 was omitted

Outcome 2.2 and the output 2.2.1 now focus on the development and adoption of incentive models.

b4. Area under forest and land restoration is 2 500ha this has been included in the co indicator template.

Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration ? 4500 ha

Area of forest and forest land under restoration ? 2500 ha

Area of natural grass and woodlands under restoration ? 150 000 ha

Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity ((hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)- 2500 ha

b5. Yes 3.2.2 will not be relevant and it was deleted

[1] Responsible refers to sustainable practices being adopted, and standards being adhered to

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a) Yes, the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC are proportional with 5% and 5.2% respectively. Cleared.

b) Yes, the PMC is equal to 5% of the total GEF grant. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a)

a.1. The increased GHG emissions in the AFOLU sector from 2199.08 Gg CO₂e in 1994 to 2416.97 Gg CO₂e in 2017 doesn't correspond to +83.7%. Please correct.

a.2. The baseline scenario focuses mainly on environmental problems en notably climate change impacts. This corresponds to the previous section. Under the baseline scenario, please describe here the wool and mohair value chain and its stakeholders, the institutions involved, relevant policies and initiatives.

b) Among the barriers, the weak institutional capacities and enabling environment should be more clearly identified as it is an important rationale for component 1. Please consider the relevance of adding this barrier.

May 15, 2023:

a)

a.1. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

a.2 The text remains mostly focussed on problems and the added paragraph under the alternative scenario section is related to what the project will do and how it will work (not the baseline). The description still miss important information on how the value chain and its stakeholders work, the institutions involved, relevant policies and existing relevant

initiatives and projects which is the environment where the new project will operate and articulate with. Please describe the baseline under a specific and clear baseline section.

a.2 bis. Related to the above, in order to improve the clarification of the proposal, please move and merge as appropriate the text under "Alternative scenario" with the section "B. Project Description" where it belongs (it is not part of the rationale/baseline).

b) Thank you for the consideration and adding the barrier 2. Cleared.

June 9, 2023:

a.2 and a.2 bis. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2023

a.2 The baseline scenario has been reviewed to reflect how the value chain and its stakeholders work, the institutions involved, relevant policies and existing relevant initiatives and projects

a.2 Text under Alternative Scenario has been moved to the introductory part of the "B. Project Description"

12 May 2023

a1) The GHG emissions increased by 9.9%. This was corrected.

a2) This description has been given and is further elaborated in the Alternative Scenario in the subsequent section.

b) The weak institutional capacities and enabling environment barrier has been added

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a) The project approach is presented as the most appropriate considering considering the objectives sought and the context. Cleared.

b) Yes, improving resilience of the environment, the rangeland management and the production system is a key objective of the project. Cleared.

c)

c.1. The ROLL-GEF project (GEF ID 10723) has been approved recently with similar objectives and shared geographies. Please clarify the difference between the 2 projects, and describe how they are complementary, how they will articulate, create synergies and avoid overlaps.

c.2. Considering this project is building on previous investments such as the WAMPP, it is critical to understand what were the objectives and achievements of these investments and what has not been achieved or was missing so that the activities proposed by this project can be justified. The proposal needs to demonstrate the proposed project is not doing the same as others before. Please clarify accordingly.

d) The stakeholders and their respective role are not clear as mentioned above about the baseline. Please elaborate further on the stakeholders targeted in the project and their role.

May 15, 2023:

c)

c.1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

c.2 We note a new paragraph under the alternative scenario which is a copy-paste of a paragraph previously place in the project summary. This text is not clear about what is the WAMPP, its results and why this GEF funded project is needed after the WAMPP soon termination. Please elaborate further on this issue.

d. Partially. The description mainly focuses on identifying some stakeholders and some engagements of the private sector. Please complete describing further in the different outputs of the project who will be engaged and how (for instance on policy and regulatory framework review and improvement, carbon accounting, Biodiversity monitoring system, market incentive systems...).

June 9, 2023:

c.2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

d. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2023

c.2 The paragraph has been moved to the introduction of the **Project Description?** where the WAMPP project is outlined covering what is archived and what the new project will cover

d. This has been included under alternative scenarios.

12 May 2023

c.1) The difference and complementarity between the two projects has been included under **project Rationale?**. Synergies will be ensured and duplication will be avoided

c2) The information on WAMPP has been included under **project Rationale?**

d) This has been elaborated under the **Baseline scenario and any associated baseline project?**

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) **Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

b) **Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a)

a.1. The paragraph "To promote inclusive and environmentally sustainable growth... and natural ecosystem restoration." is not clear. The first sentence has no subject and the paragraph says twice the project will achieve its goals through/by improving biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and natural ecosystem restoration. Please read this paragraph and improve the message.

a.2. Please revise the diagram of the Theory of change. Some numbering and titles of project components and outputs are incorrect or different from the project structure, especially for the component 1. In addition we don't see the relation between the different blocks of the ToC. Please adjust and complete the diagram of the Theory of change so that 1- it reflects the project structure and logic and 2- it shows the expected causal pathways (adding arrows).

b)

b.1. The proposal indicates that the project will finance the development and implementation of a biodiversity monitoring system, that will lead to biodiversity management plans to be developed by ?coalitions?. Please explain with more details what are these envisioned processes and how they will translate into actions/activities for conserving, restoring, and enhancing the biodiversity value of landscapes, as well as increasing connectivity.

b.2. Given the central importance of private sector integration and sustainable asset production and management, as well as strong links to export and local markets, it will be important to provide more details on leveraging and engagement of beneficiaries and how they will benefit from the VC platform. Have the key investors been identified ? What are the current relationships to build on? The approaches to engagement and participation should also be detailed.

b.3. It is unclear how the responsible standards will be defined and how the market incentive mechanism will be established. Please elaborate further on this aspect which is very important for the project success.

May 18, 2023:

a)

a.1. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

a.2. The outcomes in the diagram of the Theory of change are different from those in the component description. Please clarify with consistent information in the project description and in the TOC.

a.2bis. In the diagram of the Theory of change, the name of the outcome "Responsible for wool and mohair production" is unclear. Please clarify.

b)

b.1. Thank you for the additional information. Please move this information under the output 1.2.2 where it is more relevant, remove the repeated paragraph "A biodiversity monitoring system will be developed... buffer zones etc)", clarify what are the co-called "coalitions", and correct the typo "will also will also".

b.2. Thank you for the additional information. Please note that this information is not part of the baseline scenario and include it as appropriate in the outputs/outcomes description.

b.3. We don't see clearly the difference from the previous review in the description. Please clarify where is the additional text under the TOC.

June 9, 2023:

a)

a.2. No, the outcomes in the diagram of the Theory of change are still different from those in the component description (there are 4 outcomes in the theory of change and 8 outcomes in the component description). Please clarify with consistent information in the project description and in the TOC.

Also, we still note inconsistent information between the Project overview table and the components description where we find the following:

- The "Intervention 2.2.2 Reduced herd size and GHG emissions from small ruminant production" is not in the Project overview table and shouldn't the numbering be 2.1.2 instead of 2.2.2?;

- There are two outputs 2.2.2 (the first one being a repetition of the output 2.2.1);

- The title of the Outcome: 3.2 is different in the Project overview table and in the components description;

- Do we need 2 titles "intervention" and "output" in several places of the project description? (it's confusing). Please consider removing "intervention";

Please ensure the information under the project components description is consistent throughout all the project description including with the Project overview table.

a.2.bis. No, in the diagram of the Theory of change, there is still the same outcome titled: "Responsible for wool and mohair production". Please revise.

b)

b.1. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

b.2. Please clarify where exactly this information has been moved in the appropriate outputs/outcomes.

b.3. The footnotes are quite general on what a responsible standard should be and could be the kind of incentives. During the PPG phase, it will be very important to clarify how the sustainable market will be developed in the component description, especially on financial mechanism and the demand side aspects. Cleared.

July 28, 2023:

a.2. Partially. The names of the outcomes 1.2 and 3.2 are different in the TOC and in the Indicative Project Overview table. As this comment is not crucial and can easily be fixed during PPG phase, the comment is cleared.

b.2. The agency response is not clear as the comment was not about biodiversity monitoring but the private sector integration. Nevertheless we can find the expected information in the description of the alternative scenario. Cleared.

b.3 Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

June 23, 2023

All the titles have been checked to be consistent.

The title on output 2.2.2 repeated has been deleted

The titles interventions have been omitted

b.2 The section biodiversity monitoring has been taken to output

1.2.2

The section on responsible standards was moved to output 2.2.1.

Noted at PPG phase, sustainable market will be developed in the component description, especially on financial mechanism.

26 May 2023

a.2 All the outcomes in the results framework have been included in the theory of change

a.2 The outcome has been revised now reads Sustainable rangeland management practices adopted

B.1 The information on biodiversity has been moved to output 1.2.2

The repeated paragraph has been deleted.

typo "will also will also has been corrected

b.2 The additional information has been removed from baseline scenario

b.3. The incentives and responsible standards definition has been provided as footnotes in the TOC section.

12 May 2023

a.1) The first sentence has been deleted to improve clarity.

a.2) The theory of change diagram has been revised by including the pathways

b.1) Now included as the last paragraph under theory of change.

b.2) The private sector integration has been elaborated on under section ?Baseline scenario and any associated baseline project?

b.3) How the responsible standards will be defined and how the market incentive mechanism will be established is now included under ?theory of Change?

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

The proposal doesn't provide clear information on its incremental/additional cost reasoning. What would be the situation without this project? Please elaborate on this aspect.

May 18, 2023:

Partially. Please note that the GEF finances the incremental or additional costs associated with transforming a project with national/local benefits to deliver global environmental benefits (hiring staff per se is not part of the incremental reasoning). The incremental cost reasoning ensures that GEF funds do not substitute for existing development finance but provide new and additional funding to produce agreed global environmental benefits. Please elaborate further in the Project Description on what would be the situation without this project (in addition to scaling) and, very important, how the project is articulated with and build on the existing baseline to deliver global environmental benefits.

June 9, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Please correct the typo: "conserve meor landscapes".

July 28, 2023:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

June 23, 2023

The word "meor" corrected

26 May 2023

This has been included under the Project Description section just before Gender Equity and Women Empowerment

12 May 2023

- ? - The GEF financing will allow for an environmental specialist to be hired as part of the project, therefore, bringing in a critical human resource to the intervention.
- ? - On the programmatic front, the GEF resources are geared at financing critical activities related to enhanced rangeland/land management and without the incremental costs, the ability to scale this activity would be substantially limited.
- Moreover, the prospective work on carbon in-setting and exploring natural capital accounting that can underpin the wool and mohair value chain, reflects transformative innovations that fundamentally require the GEF incremental costs. Should these funds not be availed, then the interventions cannot be financed.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

- a) Yes, cleared.
- b) The GEF Agency doesn't plan to undertake execution support. Cleared.
- c) Yes, cleared.
- d) Yes, knowledge, learning outputs and communication are included in component 3 and further described in a dedicated knowledge management section. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

- a)
 - a.1. Please clarify the difference in terms of land use and management between the area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (GEF indicator 4.1) and the area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems (GEF indicator 4.3).
 - a.2. Surprisingly, with different budget and activities, the expected result in terms of GHG emission mitigation for this project is exactly the same as the one for the ROLL-GEF project (9,901,543 tCO₂e)! Please clarify and provide the calculation.
- b) The proposed number of direct project beneficiaries, 225,000 people, corresponds to 10% of the Country's total population, which could be an indicative of the potential project impact but which looks very ambitious too. Please explain how the number of beneficiaries has been assessed and confirm.

May 18, 2023:

- a)
 - a.1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

a.2. Thank you for the correction but we don't find the calculation. Please provide the calculation leading to the expected result.

b)

b.1. The clarification requested is missing. Please respond to the question raised in the previous review: Please explain how the number of beneficiaries (which looks ambitious) has been assessed and confirm.

b.2. The core indicators table is filled out with the number of families (45,000), which is not correct and different from the number of beneficiaries (225,000). Please use in this table the number of direct beneficiaries.

June 9, 2023:

a.2. Thank you for providing the calculation. Cleared.

b.1 and b2. Thank for for the clarification and correction. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2023

The calculation will be added as an attachment.

About 225 000 people (household members) will directly receive project services, corresponding to 45 000 households. The targeted areas having an average of 5 members per household in the targeted areas.

Additional informational information has been added under the methodological approach.

12 May 2023

a.1) The area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems will include rangelands excluding forests and other non production areas.

Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity will be hectares of land under qualitative assessment, non certified.

a.2) This was an omission, the final exact contribution will determined during design stage.

However, the preliminary GHG emission mitigation -5 060 149 tCO₂e to be confirmed by EX-ACT recalculation at CEO endorsement stage.

b) The proposed number of direct project beneficiaries is now included in the ?Core Indicators? table.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a) Yes, the climate risk in particular is well documented under the project rationale. cleared.

b) On the Financial Management and Procurement risk, the mitigation measure "Put in place grants and promote business relationships among all stakeholders in the program area" is not clear. Please clarify.

c) Yes, cleared.

May 19, 2023:

b) Thank you for the clarification. Please correct the typo "itermediary".

June 9, 2023:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

26 May 2023

Thank you the typo has been corrected

12 May 2023

b) This mitigation measure has been omitted since it does not align well with the risk .
Instead a new risk and mitigation has been added to the table

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

a) Yes, especially through the improvement of the sustainability of the value chain. cleared.

b) Yes, the development of incentives and certification (if successful) will be innovative and should facilitate scaling-up. Cleared.

c) Yes, through the participation of several ministries in charge of agriculture, environment, industry and trade and local governments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

The project objective is to promote inclusive, biodiversity friendly and environmentally sustainable growth of the wool and mohair value chain by improving biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, catchment management and restoration of water and natural ecosystems in Lesotho. The project is well aligned with the BD focal area priorities on Biodiversity Mainstreaming, with substantial activities proposed for improving and changing production practices to be more biodiversity-positive and to promote sustainable use of biodiversity as appropriate. The project is also aligned with LD

and CCM FA promoting SLM and land restoration and providing benefits in terms of GHG emission mitigation in the AFOLU sector. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

National policies, plans or strategies related to the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable value chains remains unclear. Please briefly elaborate on these topics to show the full project alignment.

May 19, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 May 2023

A paragraph has been added on national strategies which aligns with the project.

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

The proposal includes identification of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework targets the project will contribute and an how it will contribute. Please note that the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is not anymore under negotiation and use "Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework" instead.

May 19, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 May 2023

Suggestion well noted. Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework has been included.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

1. The proposal indicates the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities were consulted while it is not clear who they are in the list of people consulted. Please clarify.
2. There isn't any summary of the consultations including dates, venue and outcomes. Please provide a summary of the consultations.
3. In the table of people consulted, there is a mix between the 2 columns "Designation" and "Organisations". Please ensure the information in these columns is accurate and consistent with the title of the column.

May 19, 2023:

- 1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the additional information and amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 May 2023

1. Reference to 'Indigenous Peoples' has been removed since Lesotho does not have 'Indigenous Peoples' as defined by IFAD SECAP but what is relevant here is the 'Local Communities'.

The names of the community members consulted have been indicated in the list of people consulted. The Project Preparation Grant will be used to conduct extensive stakeholder consultations through focus groups and survey during design stage

1. 2. There were three in country visits during which consultations were held for the WaMCoP:

- Conceptualisation: 1 ? 11 March 2022 ? bulk of the consultations took place in the field oftentimes at the selected houses of respective local representatives. Key outcomes from this consultation related to the following ? the issues around the unsustainable stocking ratio; the need to devise alternative pathways to support rural communities; the need to ensure that equitable services are received by all affected stakeholders; the necessity to support HIV affected households.

- Design: 1-23 June 2022 ? the major consultation with affected stakeholders once again took place across several different venues, including shearing sheds, which often housed a number of community members. Key outcomes related to these consultations centred on the following: ensuring the project is youth sensitive, developing the fibre-processing sub-sector for greater inclusion of women; exploring a low-carbon pathway for the livestock industry (this cleared the pathway for GEF resources to be sought after)

- GEF Scoping: 1 August ? 15 August 2022 ? once again the preferred modality to meet with stakeholders was to visit them directly at their place of work/residence. Key outcomes from this mission related to the following: to develop a targeted intervention for the wool and mohair sector that ensures it responds to environmental, climate change and biodiversity related considerations; developing natural capital accounting processes for the wool and mohair sector that can further drive biodiversity monitoring; using the project as an entry point to address soil erosion and water retention issues.

3. Mix between the 2 columns "Designation" and "Organisations". Has been corrected.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

The country STAR allocation is available for this project. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

Yes cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

The letter of endorsement includes \$200,000 for PPG while it should be up to \$150,000 for a \$6 million project. Nevertheless the PPG amount in the Portal is correct (\$150,000). Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023:

For the co-financing provided by the private sector, there should be a different line for each of the co-financier (GSI, Textile exchange, BKB, Lesotho National Wool and Mohair Growers Association). Please complete the table individualizing the support of each co-financier.

May 19, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 May 2023

Co-finance from each co-financier (GSI, Textile exchange, BKB, Lesotho National Wool and Mohair Growers Association) has been allocated a different line.

Private sector player	Financing envelope (USD)
GSI South Africa	200 000
Textile Exchange	2 000 000
BKB	2 000 000
Lesotho National Wool and Mohair Growers Association	1 000 000
	5 200 000

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

No, the letter of endorsement includes \$200,000 for PPG while it is \$150,000 in the Portal. As a consequence, there are inconsistencies in the values allocated in the financing tables (Annex A) and the Letter of Endorsement (LoE). The amount included in the LoE is not correct as the maximum amount of PPG with a project budget up to \$6 million is \$150,000. Nevertheless, as long as the amounts in Portal are not higher than in LoE, which is the case for this project, there is no need for a new LoE. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Climate Change Mitigation, Climate Change Adaptation and Biodiversity are not the project's principal objectives: please assign 1 for this Rio Markers.

May 19, 2023:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

12 May 2023

Rio Markers have been assigned 1

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

April 28, 2023

Not yet, please address the comments above.

May 19, 2023:

Not yet, please address the remaining comments.

June 9, 2023:

Not yet, please address the remaining comments.

August 18, 2023:

Thank you for addressing the comments. Nevertheless, last checking on alignments with GEF policy and guidance revealed the need to improve the following aspects (please indicate clearly where the text has been completed/modified to facilitate the review by the GEF Secretariat). Also, please resubmit this PIF by the time of next Work Program review (receipt deadline for PIF submission is October 18, 2023).

1. On Gender:

- a. The project has very strong gender components. Under the sub-section Kunming-Montreal GBF (Section on Lesotho's Government Policies), please make reference to Target 23 of the GBF, which is on gender-responsive implementation of the GBF and empowerment of women and integrate this in the project design.
- b. Please incorporate gender perspectives in the following outputs: 1.3.2; 2.2.2.
- c. Under M&E, please include monitoring of the Gender Action Plan implementation

2. On Knowledge Management: An overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Project Description. Proposal includes KM&L deliverables that enable and enhance access to knowledge and information. However, while plans for communication and dissemination are mentioned, there is no reference to an overall Communication Strategy. Thus, the agency is requested to include a brief description of a project Communications Strategy/Plan for outreach, awareness raising and dissemination of outputs/results/lessons. This can be added to Component 3.

September 15, 2023:

Thank you for addressing the last comments. The PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

12 September 2023. This is well noted.

1. Target 23 has been added.

b. Gender perspectives have been added to 1.3.2 and 2.2.2.

c. Monitoring of gender action plan implementation has been added under M&E.

2. Communication strategy was added to component 3 as recommended.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

July 28, 2023:

1. During the PPG phase, it will be very important to clarify how the sustainable market will be developed in the component description, especially on financial mechanism and the demand side aspects.

2. Please ensure the information provided in the CEO endorsement request is consistent throughout all the project description, and in particular the names of the components, outcomes and outputs.

Agency's Comments

12 September 2023

Aspects for clarification at PPG phase and additional comments on ensuring consistency across all documents at CEO endorsement have been noted.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/28/2023	5/15/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/19/2023	5/26/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/9/2023	7/18/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/18/2023	9/12/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/15/2023	