

El Salvador Integrated Landscape Management and Restoration

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10346

Countries

El Salvador

Project Name

El Salvador Integrated Landscape Management and Restoration

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

5/5/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

No, the Focal Area Outcomes of the Objectives/Programs 2.5 is not correct. It should be "Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN". Please correct.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 14, 2021:

1. The table B of the Portal doesn't reflect exactly what is reported in the project description of the Project Document. For instance, the project description mentions under component 1 the activity of strengthening public sector coordination which is not clearly captured in Table B. Please complete the Table B so that it reflects exactly the project components with their outcomes and outputs as presented in the Project Document (including in the Annex 2: Project Description).

2. The Table B mentions as output "67,700 ha monitored through the ISR". This output is not mentioned in the project description. Please justify this restoration-related activity under the component 1 (shouldn't we need to monitor the other non-restored areas too?) and clarify how it relates with the GEF core indicators including the area of landscapes under improved practices.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

1. Considering the contribution from UNDP comes actually from a project funded by the Adaptation Fund, the Adaptation Fund should be indicated under the "Name of Co-financier" instead of UNDP.

2. According to the letter provided, the type of co-financing from the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN) should be referred as "In-kind" in Table C. Please correct.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

In the Annex C of the Portal, the table provided on the utilization of PPG reports that no money has been spent or is committed. Considering activities were undertaken to design the project please explain and revise the table as needed.

Agency Response
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

1. The expected GHG emission mitigation appears relatively low. It may come from the low decrease of the deforestation rate with the project from 0.65% to 0.6%. Please explain and consider the feasibility of increasing the ambition. In addition, please upload the Ex-ACT tool in the document section of the Portal.
2. The expected area restored is significantly less than at PIF stage. This is essentially due the the drop in the areas of forests and mangroves restoration. Please justify this new target and consider the possibility of rising the ambition.
3. Please complete the "GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet" uploaded with the results which were estimated at PIF stage.
4. Please add the expected number of beneficiary in the Project Results Framework (at least in the Annex A of the CEO Endorsement Request).

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 18, 2021:

1. In paragraph 7 of the PAD, the following information is unclear "Approximately 15 percent of the country?s territory is experiencing severe land,...". Maybe the word "degradation" is missing. Please clarify.
2. The overall barriers the project is trying to address should be more explicit in the narrative and in the Theory of Change diagram. The project document mentions ?gaps? in Para 14 and ?constraints? in Annexes 1 & 2. With several past and ongoing initiatives and problems with land degradation still being faced, what are the barriers preventing things from progressing further and which of these is the project addressing? These should be clearly shown in the ToC with links to the specific project components/outcomes that will be addressing these barriers. Please elaborate further on the barriers and clarify the ToC accordingly.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 18, 2021:

One of the main problems identified is the "unplanned expansion of sugarcane production and production of basic crops". What is the current context as it relates to national level and local level land use planning? What is the regulatory environment associated with this? Is there enforcement? Have these activities been considered by the project to complement the proposed interventions around finance, governance, restoration, SLM etc. Or are these interventions being covered by other initiatives? Please elaborate further on these questions.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 19, 2021:

1. Under the component 2, the sub-component 2 will support the implementation of the BONSUCRO Standard. Please clarify the activities included in this sub-component, what concrete environmental benefits they will provide and how.
2. The project management can't be included using resources of specific component. Please remove the name of "management" and related activities from component 3 and include the corresponding expenses under the PMC.
3. Please remove the PMC from component 3 in the budget table.
4. The knowledge management plan includes activities implemented under each component, including component 3. Nevertheless, according to the budget and the project description in the PAD, the component 3 only includes activities of project management and M&E. In addition, we learn that the budget of component 3 is \$903,600 in the uploaded KM document while it is \$359,602 in the Budget table. Please clarify and adjust the component 3 accordingly in the budget and in the project description.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 19, 2021:

It is unclear where is the information on how the project is aligned with the focal area strategies (BD 1-1, LD 1-1, LD 1-3 and LD 2-5). Please clarify.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

Partially. The project document under the section "Global Environmental Benefits (GEB)" (page 19) presents the expected results in terms of GHG emission mitigation but there is no detailed mention of the other expected results reported under the core indicators section (areas restored and under improved management). Please elaborate further on these environmental benefits too, especially considering the important decrease in the restoration targets.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

Partially. The project document does explain how the project impact will be sustainable. Nevertheless, we don't see the explanation showing that the project is innovative and include the potential for scaling up. Please complete on these aspects too.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 14, 2021:

Partially. The stakeholder engagement plan uploaded in the Portal is in Spanish. Please provide a summary in the Portal which includes, in addition to what is already presented (stakeholders engagement in the project), a presentation of the stakeholders, and a description of the consultations conducted and their results informing the project design.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 14, 2021:

1. The description informs that a Gender Analysis was part of the consultation process for project design. Nevertheless, the uploaded "Annex 3. Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan" is very general on the current situation in the country and in the project area and the consultation process for this project and its results remain unclear. Please elaborate further on the consultation process informing the project design.

2. In the uploaded "Annex 3. Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan", the Table 7 exceeds the limit of the page. Please adjust so that we can read all the table.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 14, 2021:

Partially. Please elaborate further so that the text clearly includes the description of each kind of stakeholder from the private sector involved in the project (producers, cooperatives, industries...), what are their links and how they will engage in and benefit from the project support.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

1. The risks to the project analysis is very limited: only violence and climate are mentioned. Please explore other potential risks such as weak local capacity, stakeholders actual interest and engagement, coordination among project stakeholders including institutions, availability of funds for the CES... and elaborate further as needed. Please indicate a rating for each identified risk.

2. The climate risk analysis relies on the climate risk profile available on line which focuses on the expected impacts of climate change. Please summarize the key findings of this document, including climate projections, rate the level of key hazards, and elaborate further on the mitigation measures which are missing.

3. In addition to impacts and mitigation measures, the COVID-19 analysis should also include opportunities this project could provide for a green recovery and improved resilience to possible new pandemic. Please complete accordingly.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 14, 2021:

1. Please also consider the relevance of possible coordination with and lessons learned from other GEF projects such as "Enabling concerted Source to Sea management in the Paz river watershed" (GEF ID #10074) and "Climate Change Adaptation to Reduce Land Degradation in Fragile Micro-Watersheds Located in the Municipalities of Texistepeque and Candelaria de la Frontera" (GEF ID #4616) which take place in the same area.
2. Under Annex E of the project description in the Portal, the project budget is uploaded twice. Please remove one version.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

We note the alignment with the national climate strategy and the SDGs. Nevertheless, considering the strong focus on the GEF LD Focal Area, please elaborate further in the "Annex J: Additional Project Information" on the alignment of the project with the national priorities in the framework of the UNCCD. In particular, please clarify how the project is aligned with and contribute to El Salvador's LDN strategy including targets setting.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

Yes, the Knowledge Management Strategy & Budget is uploaded as Annex H in the Documents section of the Portal. Cleared.

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

Yes, through the document "Appraisal Environmental and Social Review Summary" uploaded in the Documents section of the Portal. Cleared.

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

The audits should be covered by the PMC, not M&E. Please amend the Annex I and the budget accordingly.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 18, 2021:

Please correct the Rio Marker selection: considering this project hasn't a clear and explicit objective on climate change adaptation, please assign a '0.' In case the project developers would like to highlight climate change adaptation as a result of the project, they may want to highlight adaptive management, increased resilience or reduced vulnerability to impacts of climate change addressed through project activities and select a "1" for the Rio Marker related to adaptation.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 12, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 20, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

From the PIF approval, there was no additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

The response to the German comment on the need to add/complete chapters (on 1. Baseline Scenario and Projects, 5. Risks, 6. Coordination, 7. Consistency with National Priorities, and 8. Knowledge Management) can be found in Annexes J and H and not only Annex H. Please amend accordingly.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

Yes if the comment above on PPG is addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 12, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 20, 2021:

Thank you for the proposal. The project is not yet ready for recommendation. Please address the comments raised above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations