

El Salvador Integrated Landscape Management and Restoration

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10346

Countries

El Salvador

Project Name

El Salvador Integrated Landscape Management and Restoration

Agenices

World Bank

Date received by PM

9/24/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

1- The indicative Project description summary appears as a text in the Portal and not in the format of Table B, which also includes, for each component, the financial aspects and more details on the project outcomes and outputs. Please use the right format of Table B.

2- The components, outputs and outcomes are different in the Portal and the GEF data sheet on one side and in the WB documents (PCN and PID) on the other side. Please ensure the project components and their associated budget are the same throughout all the documents provided.

3- The organization of the activities doesn't appear balanced with 2 components (1 and 2) requesting 12% of the budget and 1 component (3) requesting 88%. Please consider if a more balanced composition of the concept would be more appropriate for the project efficiency and clarity.

4- Component 4 in the Table B of the GEF Data Sheet has no budget. Please allocate the necessary resources to implement this component.

4 November 2019:

1-2-3-4. Thank you for the clarification and adjustments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. 1. The correct format was used.

2. 2. Apologies, there was a mistake in the package distributed. The correct files are being presented now.

3. 3. As suggested during the Project Review Meeting, components 2 and 3 have been merged.

4. 4. Budget for Component 3 (before component 4) is reflected in the Project Management Cost (PMC) (5%) of the Project.

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

25 September 2019:

Yes, the investment mobilized is significant for such a project (land degradation in rural areas). Cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25 September 2019:

Yes, with this project the country uses all its STAR allocation. Cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25 September 2019:

Yes, because the country benefits from the full flexibility of its focal area allocation. Cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not applicable.

Agency Response N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not applicable.

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not applicable.

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not applicable.

Agency Response N/A

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

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

N/A - ok

Indicators has been adjusted to correct an error.

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

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

26 September 2019:

The project submission needs further details on the root causes and barriers at the institutional level. For instance, what are the current planning instruments, governance and regulatory framework that allow, despite the already strong national engagement for restoration, land degradation and deforestation? What are the capacity issues faced by the relevant government agencies at the national and local level in relation to landscape restoration? The private sector is targeted in the project, but the barriers that prevent engagement by the private sector in sustainable production are not outlined. Please explain and complete accordingly.

5 November 2019:

Thank you for the complement. Nevertheless the new inputs are succinct and the "brief theory of change" doesn't completely respond to the comments raised. Please elaborate further and indicate where exactly in the documents is the response to the comment.

7 November 2019:

Thank you for the complement and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Further detail has been included in the theory of change explaining the activities that target the enabling environment for sustainable natural resource management at the landscape scale. Please see PCN document uploaded in the Road Map

5 November 2019:

Further detail on the root causes and barriers at the institutional level have been included in the Sectoral Context and in the theory of change presented in the Concept Note (CN) and in the sections of the CN indicated below, explaining the activities that target the enabling environment for sustainable natural resource management at the landscape scale (Please see paragraphs 11, 16, 22, 23, and of Concept Note).

Planning instruments are not considered a major cause of deforestation and land degradation in the targeted area. In fact, the project area counts with significant territorial planning (Local Development Plan), which already takes into account, to some extent, considerations related to land degradation and biodiversity. The project will however strengthen planning capacity through the generation and consolidation of technical information on the ecological services and how do they relate with current land uses, and monitoring sustainability in the landscape to further strengthen capacities to plan land use with stronger focus on land degradation and biodiversity conservation.

Coordination between the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture is needed, as well as with the local government agriculture development offices, to ensure that policies and subsidies in the agricultural sector are not contradictory of environmental sustainability objectives. In addition, there is a need to strengthen extension services and ensure they have the capacity to transfer knowledge about production practices that are sustainable.

With regards to the private sector, some of main the barriers that prevent the private sector from adopting sustainable practices are lack of awareness of the benefits sustainable production practices and costs of environmental degradation; and lack financial mechanisms for investment in sustainable production systems. The project aims to address both of these issues by creating awareness by generating evidence and by creating private sector roundtables, as well as establishing innovative financial mechanisms. Please see paragraphs 23, 27, 31, 55 of CN.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

26 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

26 September 2019:

1. LDFA Objectives- Clarification needed. While the project indicates it is aligned with Objective 2 of LDFA, the objectives listed (LD1-1 & 1-4) in Table A of the GEF Data Sheet and in the Portal are aligned with Objective 1 of the LDFA. Specifically LD 1-1 *Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Land Management (SLM)* and LD 1-4 is *Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape*.

There is some misalignment with the GEF LDFA objectives that are being targeted or the references to the sub-objectives need to be aligned among the documents. LDFA Objective 2 and sub-objective 2-5 specifically refers to *Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN*. We expect Objective 2 to assist countries to strengthen their enabling environment (planning and policy framework, monitoring protocols and tools, integrating LDN across land use planning and sector policies etc.) for **on the ground implementation of LDN through SLM, FLR, INRM etc. which is Objective 1 (with sub-objectives 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, 1-4)**.

The Concept Note in Para 23 refers to LDFA Objective 2 only, but then also refers to sub-objective LD 1-1, LD 1-3, LD 2-5. Some clarification is needed.

2. Theory of Change and Project Approach- Related to point 1 above, the Theory of Change could benefit from further details on the barriers/root causes of the problem as well as a few assumptions. Additionally, the TOC doesn't specify activities targeting the enabling environment as outlined above, such as strengthening of the existing land use planning frameworks (plans and policies) at the national or local level by integrating LDN. This could ensure field-based interventions including those targeting the private sector are sustained, upscaling of activities and reduce the negative spillover effects in areas with existing land cover.

-Component 1- Beyond '*strengthening restoration boards, waterboards alliances, and a private sector roundtable*' is there anything else that is required to lay the foundation for the stakeholders to promote and practice the principles of LDN- *avoid, reduce, reverse*. This may be a useful consideration.

Will the '*analysis of the cost of land and ecosystem degradation*' be used to inform policy decisions on land use planning or future investments in land resources?

-Component 2 & 3- As the project has been aligned to LD 1-1 -Sustainable Land Management (SLM) how will agricultural extension support officers be involved in the project, again to ensure the practices are institutionalized.

3.Indicators- A key co-benefit that LDFA targets is improvement of livelihoods and in this case that would refer to beneficiaries such as the farmers. The indicators *on # of people with improved capacities to apply sustainable land use practices in production systems (Components 2 and 3)*, should in this case be more specific- who are the people that are being targeted for improved capacities? Please also include an indicator that measures improvement in income for farmers or other target groups, as a result of the interventions.

4. Duration of the project: The project duration is 4 years in the CPI and 5 years in the PCN and GEF Data Sheet. Please propose the same duration in the different documents provided.

5 November 2019:

Thank you for the clarification and adjustments. Cleared.

Agency Response

November 5, 2019 Responses are modified to provide clear references to the relevant documents.

1. Clarification has been provided on the goals and objectives of the LD focal area the project supports in PID and Concept Note (Please see paragraphs 24 and 25 of Concept Note). LD 1-4 will not be included.

2. Further detail has been included in the theory of change explaining the activities that target the enabling environment for sustainable natural resource management at the landscape scale. As explained in Section 1, above, although the project will contribute to strengthen and use planning and monitoring of landscape sustainability, the main focus of the project will be to show how to translate some of the existing planning instruments into effective land restoration and scaling up in other regions of the country.

Component 1 - Yes, both the public sector coordination as well the engagement and coordination with the private sector are required. Further detail on how the governance for integrated landscape management will be strengthened are included in the description of Component 1 in CN. Both the analysis on cost of land degradation and the landscape sustainability index are aimed inform used to inform public and private decisions, and monitor their impacts over time (Please see p. 31-34 in CN).

Component 2 and 3 - Further information about the involvement of agricultural extension support officers is included in Concept Note, PID and Datasheet (Please see description of component 1 – para 38 and 40). Mainly indicating that technology transfer will be in charge of CENTA and in some cases in local governments, which in turn will be strengthened to ensure that sustainable practices are institutionalized.

3. A complete set of PDO and intermediate results indicators will be developed during project preparation.

As explained in the Concept Note (See para. 45), target farmers are small and medium size farmers. Approximately 300 sugar cane producers, mainly medium and small holders, will benefit with direct technical assistance and incentives; while at least 1000 producers, mainly small holders and communities, will receive support to restoration practices and key ecosystem conservation. In addition, the population in the entire landscape will benefit from improved ecosystem services (mainly hydrological), reduced erosion, and reduced contamination.

An indicator that measures improved income has been included (See para. 25, Outcome for Land Degradation Focal Area (LD-1-1)).

4. Duration has been adjusted to 5 years in all documents.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

26 September 2019:

Not fully. Please see comments under Question 3.

5 November 2019:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Please see response under Question 3.

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

26 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

Yes. Nevertheless, the estimated results are different in table F and in the Core Indicators Worksheet. Please ensure the project results are the same throughout the information provided.

4 November 2019:

GEF policy recommends to calculate the Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated over a period of 20 years and not 5 years, unless a strong justification is provided. In addition, in GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet the estimated benefits should be reported in the "PIF stage" column (and not in the "CEO Endorsement" column). Please consider the period of 20 years to estimate the climate benefits and report the result in the right column of the Core Indicator Worksheet.

7 November 2019:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Estimated results have been adjusted

November 4, 2019

Thank you for your comment, GHG emissions indicator was updated as required, covering the period of 20 years

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

26 September 2019:

The innovation of the concept relies much on the engagement of the private sector, which is indeed very important. Nevertheless, there is not a clear description in the proposal of the potential of the project for innovation, sustainability and scaling up as expected. Please complete accordingly.

4 November 2019:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response The justification of the potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in the project has been strengthened in PCN and PID in the “Value-Added of GEF Involvement in the Project Demonstrated through Incremental Reasoning” section and in the “Project Justification” section of the Datasheet.
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

25 September 2019:

Yes, there is a preliminary geo-reference to the project’s intended location. Nevertheless, the title of the map is incorrect as it refers to Dominican Republic. Please correct accordingly.

4 November 2019:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response The title has been corrected in the GEF Datasheet
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

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

The requested information is missing in the GEF Data Sheet. Please provide information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women and how this issue will be taken into account during the project preparation.

4 November 2019:

In the Portal, the question "Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?" is answered by "TBD" while it is a "Yes" in the GEF data sheet. Please chose the same answer in both documents.

7 November 2019:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

The requested information has been added to the GEF Datasheet.

November 5, 2019

thank you for your comment. Correct selection was made in all documents accordingly, gender sensitive indicators will be included in the project's results framework.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

25 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

26 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

The concept informs that the project will be implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources which will lead project preparation and implementation, and the process will involve multiple stakeholders. Beyond this information, the proposal remains vague about the institutional arrangement for

project coordination among stakeholders including management, monitoring and evaluation. Please provide more details on the envisioned institutional arrangement and the role of the involved partners to implement the project.

4 November 2019:

It is unclear what is the announced "further detail" and where exactly it was included. Please explain.

7 November 2019:

Thank you for the complement and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

November 5, 2019

Further detail has been included on the institutional arrangement and capacities the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN) in the Concept Note. In addition, a list of key stakeholders and their expected role during project preparation and implementation is included in annex 4 of the Concept Note. The project will require a close coordination between MARN and the Ministry of Agriculture, and this coordination is expected to serve as a pilot and strengthen the overall coordination between these two agencies, with the objective of mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and land degradation into MAG policies.

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

26 September 2019:

Yes. Restoration is a top priority for the country which has been developing national and local strategies to tackle this issue while, at the same time strongly engaging at international, notably with the UNFCCC context, the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration and under the Bonn Challenge initiative. Cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

27 September 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response N/A - ok

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

25 September 2019:

The letter of endorsement isn't signed by the current GEF Operational Focal Point who has changed recently. Please update the letter accordingly.

4 November 2019:

A new letter of endorsement has been provided, signed by the newly appointed GEF Operational Focal Point. Cleared.

Agency Response New letter duly signed is attached to the package.

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

Not applicable.

Agency Response

N/A

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

27 September 2019:

Thank you for this project proposal which is very relevant considering the country needs and priorities. The PIF isn't recommended yet as some adjustments and clarification still need to be provided. Please address the comments above.

5 November 2019:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments and indicate exactly where are the modifications in the project documentation.

7 November 2019:

Yes, the PIF is now recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		