



Nature based solutions for increased climate resilience in Vulnerable Rural communities of Lesotho

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11387

Countries

Lesotho

Project Name

Nature based solutions for increased climate resilience in Vulnerable Rural communities of Lesotho

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

10/17/2023

Review completed by PM

11/21/2023

Program Manager

Ladu David Morris Lemi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

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

GEFSEC, October 18, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 18, 2023

Although there is concise description of the project aim and barriers to be addressed, the summary does not provided highlights of the climate change problem in Lesotho.

Please provide a brief summary of the climate issues that the project intends to address as discussed in the subsequent sections of the PIF.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, November 13, 2023

Kindly note that the issues of climate change (barriers and solutions intended to be addressed by the project) have now been incorporated under the project summary as well as in subsequent sections (e.g. theory of change) and highlighted in yellow.

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

GEFSEC, October 18, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, November 22, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, November 16, 2023

We have noticed that the suggested outputs 2.1.2 and 2.2.1 have not incorporated gender dimension as suggested above. Please reflect gender perspectives in both output 2.1.2 and 2.2.1.

GEFSEC, October 18, 2023

Yes, however, more gender specific outcomes or outputs could be incorporated into component 2. Also include gender dimensions in Outputs 2.2.1; 2.1.2, and in Component 3 - KM and Monitoring, Evaluation.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, November 21, 2023

Kindly note that we have revised the indicative project overview, project summary section and the project description section to integrate gender dimensions in not just Outputs 2.1.2 and 2.2.1 but also other outputs under Outcomes 2 and 3

IUCN, November 13, 2023

Thank you very much for your excellent comment. Please note that gender specific issues have now been incorporated into both Component 2 and 3 and highlighted in yellow.

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

GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) No. The PMC is 100% GEF financed without co-financing. Please make sure that the co-financing contribution to PMC must be proportional. This means that, at a \$0 co-financing contribution to the PMC, the GEF contribution to the PMC must be kept at \$0, and if the GEF contribution is 4.97%, the same % should apply for co-financing contribution to PMC. Please address accordingly.

c) Yes, the PMC is below the 5% threshold.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, November 13, 2023

b) Thank you very much for your comment. This has been corrected, the cofinancing figure has been added.in the table **Indicative Project Overview**. The amount is 3 000 500

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
GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments
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

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes. By mainstreaming of NbS into policy and institutional frameworks, the project is more likely to systemically address existing barriers.

c) Yes

d) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, November 13, 2023

On item (b), there is still difference between the LoE and the information in the PIF as below.

In the PIF:

Executing Agency: **Ministry of Defence, National Security and Environment (MDNSE)** will serve as the executing agency of the project, and they will co-execute with the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition (MAFSN) in collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government, Chieftainship, Home Affairs and Police.

In the LoE:

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Implementing Agency(ies) listed below. **If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by and the project executed by the IUCN.**

This means IUCN has both implementing and executing mandates. The word "executed by the IUCN" in LoE should be removed or replaced with "implemented by the IUCN".

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes. The proposal indicates that the implementing Agency will partially execute the Nbs approaches of the project while also providing technical guidance, and that the "Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE) will serve as the executing agency of the project, and they will co-execute with the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Nutrition (MAFSN) in collaboration with the Ministry of Local Government, Chieftainship, Home Affairs and Police". However, the LoE indicates that the implementing Agency will execute the projects. Could you provide more details if indeed the listed government entities are the executing agencies. If so, then the LoE should also state clear the execution mandate.

c) Yes

d) Yes

Agency's Comments

IUCN, November 14, 2023

Kindly note that an updated LoE has been uploaded in which the Executing Agency is now stated as the Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE) replacing IUCN.

IUCN, November 13, 2023

b) Kindly note that the Ministry of Defense, National Security and Environment (MDNSE) will serve as the executing agency of the project. The other government entities have now been removed as co-executing agencies, but will only partake as key stakeholders and collaborators. This is now revised in the PIF online version as well as the word version

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

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

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

GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes. Could you explain the role of FAO and the South African Government as indicated in Step 1 of the ESS form Annex D.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, November 13, 2023

c) We apologise as this was an inadvertent error; the ESS form has been corrected ? the corrected version is now uploaded.

On the country- South Africa has been replaced by Lesotho. The executing entity has also been changed from FAO to Ministry of Defence, National Security, and Environment

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

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

a) Yes, it intends to integrate NbS, by bringing together local, regional and national stakeholders to jointly plan for and implement NbS approaches, and establishing a coordinated platforms and institutional structures making it durable and transformative.

b) Yes, it intends to integrate financial tools into landscape management to support community livelihoods.

c) Yes. Several national, regional and global strategies and policies that the project is aligned with have been identified (page 29-37).

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

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes, CCA-1-1

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
GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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
GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes (Targets 2, 3, 5 & 11)

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes, however, the table for the stakeholders extends beyond the margins. Please adjust it to fit.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, November 13, 2023

Kindly note that this has now been adjusted as advised
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
GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes, but there are disparities in the figures entered into the portal. Please adjust the figures for the GEF Financing and the corresponding Agency fee in the portal as indicated in the LoE

Agency's Comments
IUCN, November 13, 2023

Kindly note that this is now corrected in the portal
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

CCA-1-1

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

No

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

No

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 19, 2023

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

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

PPG has been requested

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

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes, Co-Financing are recurrent expenditures (i.e. in-kind)

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (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

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes

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

GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

No. The template for the LoE has been modified and the footnote removed. Please provide a new LoE without any modification and the footnote in place. Alternatively, the OFP should send an email accepting the footnote to be part of the LoE.

Agency's Comments

IUCN, November 13, 2023

Kindly note that the new LoE has been issued with the footnote intact and now uploaded in the portal

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
GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

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
GEFSEC, November 14, 2023

Cleared

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Annex C is missing. Could you please include this.

Agency's Comments
IUCN, November 13, 2023

Kindly note that the map is now added in Annex C in the online PIF as well as the revised uploaded PIF

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
GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes

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

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes

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
GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC, October 20, 2023

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/20/2023	11/13/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/13/2023	11/14/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/14/2023	11/21/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)