

Sustainable and Inclusive Access to Water Program for Resilient Agriculture (PROAGUA)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12344
Countries
Cabo Verde
Project Name
Sustainable and Inclusive Access to Water Program for Resilient Agriculture
(PROAGUA)
Agencies
IFAD
Date received by PM
5/15/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Celine Augereau ep Coisy
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

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
05/18/2026

a) Cleared. The project is aligned with BD FA Objective 1, To improve conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of natural ecosystems, more specifically it addresses sustainable use of BD and BD mainstreaming in productive sectors (agriculture). The BD targeted is globally significant.

b) Yes cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks
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
06/03/2026

Cleared.

05/19/2026

Not cleared. Please complete the summary describing and explaining the BD of global significance targeted by the project, the drivers of BD loss and how the project will address them. Indeed the narrative of the summary is mainly presented through agricultural perspectives, while the objective is to "Enhance BD conservation". In particular, precise the areas targeted and if they are KBAs.

Agency's Comments

May 26, 2026

As recommended, additional info has been provided, including maps of KBAs on the target four islands (p.11). The drivers of biodiversity have also been included in the table of KBA info (p.11) and below the table (p.12). Information on how the project will contribute to addressing the drivers has been included (p.27).

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
05/19/2026

a) Yes cleared.

b) Yes cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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

Secretariat's Comments
06/03/2026

- Gender: cleared.

- M&E: cleared.

05/19/2026

Not cleared.

Gender considerations should be better integrated and visible in the formulation of outputs and activities. Please, revise. It is difficult to believe that 50% of beneficiaries will be women without a proactive behavior and specific attention on gender equality and women empowerment.

- Please ensure that output 1.1.3 is gender-responsive.

- M&E budget at 7.1% of the sub-total project costs is higher than the recommended 5% threshold for projects of similar size. Please reduce the M&E budget

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

As recommended, output 1.1.3 has been rephrased to make it more gender-responsive, and additional info provided on how the project will contribute to narrowing gender gaps and support women empowerment (p.24)

M&E budget: As recommended, the amount has been adjusted from \$289,076 to \$202,438
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
06/03/2026

b) Cleared.

05/19/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Not cleared. There is a little difference (GEF 5%, Co Financing, 4,78 %. Please correct)

c) Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks for a and c

With regards to b, as recommended, PMC co-financing has been adjusted to \$1,476,189, while GEF resources are at \$202,438.

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
06/10/2026

b) Cleared.

06/03/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Not cleared. The comment has not been addressed. Please complete for enablers.

05/19/2026

a) Please precise the KBAs or protected areas that are in the areas targeted by the project, for each of the different islands. Describe the landscapes and their dynamics in each sector targeted, in each island. Precise if those protected areas have a management plan.

Please consider also describing the different policies in the sectors considered by the project and if some incoherence have been identified (bad incentives for example).

b) Not cleared. Please precise the enablers.

Agency's Comments

May 26, 2026

Please, refer to the response under 2 (project summary). Reference has been made to the environmental policy context (p.13), however comprehensive and exhaustive policy and ecological assessments will be conducted during PPG that will provide important information that will detail, among others, policy in/coherence for relevant sectors, management situations of PAs etc.

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

06/10/2026

d) Cleared.

06/03/2026

d) Not cleared. The comment has been partially addressed. Please complete explaining how communities, community-based organizations and civil society organizations that have been consulted and the dates of these consultations.

05/19/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Yes. By improving public policies coherence, supporting more sustainable practices y productive sectors and restoring fragile ecosystems, in different islands, the project will ensure resilience.

c) Yes cleared.

d) Not cleared. The different stakeholders have been described. Please, consider adding stakeholders in education, and research and in the different administrations in the sector targeted (BD, agriculture...). The agency states that "details of the consultations with stakeholders for this PIF have been detailed in the section, "Stakeholder Engagement Process and Integration of Stakeholder Concerns in PROAGUA Design" However, please, provide information on the specific stakeholders, Including communities, community-based

organizations and civil society organizations that have been consulted and the dates of these consultations.

Agency's Comments

June 07, 2026

The comment is well received ? and in response, additional info has been added on stakeholders and the dates they were consulted (p. 33)

May 26, 2026

With regards to d), as recommended, additional information has been provided under ?Education institutions and research organizations (p.32)? More stakeholders will be engaged during PPG phase.

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

06/10/2026

b) Cleared.

06/03/2026

b)

- Component 1: Cleared.

- Component 2: Not cleared.

i) Not cleared. The comment related to CI 4.2 and Third party certification has not been addressed. Please justify this CI following GEF guidance: "This indicator captures the landscape area that achieves certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations. The project should indicate the details of third-party certification (e.g., Forest Stewardship Council, Round Table on Responsible Soy, Global Forest Alliance). References includes a review of tropical agroforestry certification schemes and a general review of biodiversity criteria in various standards and certifications. Furthermore, while not required, it is suggested that projects provide GIS files showing the extent of the land under this improved management (outside of protected areas)".

ii) Cleared.

iii) Cleared.

05/19/2026

a) Yes. Cleared.

b) Not cleared.

•Component 1: This component aims to enhance institutional capacity, policy coherence, and enforcement, and to integrate biodiversity and climate risks into spatial and sectoral planning. But in the 3 outputs, the first one is dedicated to skills improvement and capacity building. The second one is based on enhancement of community based management. The last one is about integrating biodiversity in 3 sectoral plans (tourism, agriculture, fisheries). Please, clarify if this component will address policy coherence, environmental regulations and planning at national level.

•Component 2:

- i) The description refer to a GEF project on OECMs and says that PROAGUA will "use the OECM experience as a tested modality, extending it spatially and institutionally while integrating it with land restoration, CBNRM, and policy mainstreaming instruments beyond the single-island focus". However, the CI 4.5 is not tagged. If the project intends to extend spatially OECMs, the CI 4.5 needs to be targeted, and CI 4.3 or 4.1. Currently CI 4.4.2 is tagged but there is no explanation on the Third party certification. Please precise.

- ii) Precise if restorations activities will be based on landscapes approaches and if an ecological assessment will be done before to identify, restore and/or preserve main ecological corridors, species.

- iii) Please precise if an analysis to identify inconsistent policies or bad incentives is planned. The sustainability of outcomes, especially related to livelihoods needs to be anticipated.

Agency's Comments

June 07, 2026

The comment is well received. As guided below under 5.4 comment, the tagged complement Indicator is 4.3 for sustainable land management in production systems, more aligned with the broader focus of the project. During PPG, the project will provide details on the priority landscapes, including maps of land use and land cover change.

May 26, 2026

Component 1: As requested and recommended, it has been clarified that the with a focus on enhancing institutional capacity and policy coherence, the PROAGUA will contribute to addressing policy coherence, environmental regulations and planning as they relate to addressing biodiversity loss and land degradation at regional and national level. It has also been confirmed that the project will conduct policy analysis (p. 22)

Component 2: In the design of the project, it is not intended to extend the geographic coverage of OECMs, however draw lessons and experiences from on-going efforts to inform PROAGUA's approach to land restoration. The sentence referred to in the review comment has been rephrased to bring clarity (p.28).

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
05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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
05/19/2026

a) Cleared.

b) The executing agency will be the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment.

c) Yes, cleared.

d) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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
06/10/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

06/03/2026

a) Not cleared. See comment above. Complete justification for third party certification or choose another core sub-indicator 4.

b) Not cleared. The comment on possible overlapping on Ha on CI 3 and CI 4 has not been addressed. Please answer the request on overlapping.

05/19/2026

a) Not cleared. Please, see comments above on CI 4 and OECMs and third party certification.

b) Not cleared.

- Considering that the project will take place in 4 islands, targets for CI 4 seems a bit low. Please consider improving.

- CI 4 and CI 3 seem to overlap. The PIF reports 1,600 ha under improved practices (CI 4) and 2,300 ha under restoration (CI 3). Confirm there is no double-counting between these two areas, as landscapes under restoration should not simultaneously be counted under improved practices unless distinct hectares are clearly delineated.

- CI 6: The mitigation target of 449,728 tCO₂e is large relative to the project size (\$4.25M GEF grant targeting 2,300 ha of restoration and 1,600 ha of SLM on a small island nation). No methodology narrative is provided to explain how this figure was derived, and it is not categorized as Direct vs. Indirect or AFOLU vs. non-AFOLU, as required. Please provide a full methodology narrative and apply the correct GHG categorization.

Agency's Comments

June 07, 2026

Comments related to a) and b) are well noted. In response:

a) Please, refer to the response provided under 5.1 above indicating the change from 4.2 to 4.3

b) CI 3 will focus on land restoration (for degraded production landscapes = 1,500 ha), while CI 4 will focus on other areas (for improved production landscapes = 2,000 ha, and for improved land management practices and technologies (= 800 ha).

May 26, 2026

a) Please, see response provided above.

b) As suggested CI 4 has been adjusted upwards to 2,000 ha - to be confirmed at PPG after additional consultations and baseline studies.

With regards to the mitigation potential, the methodology is explained under point (c) under the CI table (p.34). Because it is based on area from actual restoration activities, it has been categorized as direct. Also note that since CI 4 has been adjusted upwards from 1,600 ha to 2,000, automatically, the carbon potential has equally gone up. The 474,094 metric tons of CO2e is for the period of 30 years (2057), while for the life of the project, the mitigation potential is limited to 34,707 metric tons of CO2e (2032) (see annex D.1 p.48)

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

06/10/2026

c) Cleared.

06/03/2026

a)b) Cleared.

c)

i) Not cleared. Please update all the boxes in the table with the text description. In one box it is written Moderate for overall risks, but written Substantial in the text.

Overall Risk Rating	Moderate	After implementation of mitigation measures, the project's overall risk is assessed as Substantial. Environment and social, political and governance and climate risks remain significant due to structural exposure. The full design will ensure strong institutional alignment, and support to livelihoods and restoration efforts to reduce risks to achieving intended outcomes.
---------------------	----------	--

ii) Comments have been included in box 9.2 for PPG phase.

05/19/2026

a)b) Not cleared. Cabo Verde faces structural constraints in institutional capacity and enforcement, yet Political/Governance risk is rated Moderate with no explanation of how residual risk was calibrated given these conditions. Please provide clearer justification for the residual rating, particularly given the project's dependence on Ministry capacity and CBNRM enforcement

c) Not cleared. We note you have attached Social and Environmental Screening Template. An overall ESS risk is classified as Substantial.

i. Attached Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Checklist said Substantial risk. However, Environmental and Social Safeguards in D. Policy requirements (page 48) and the environmental and social risk in the Key Risks table (page 36) said Moderate risk. Please revise the environmental and social risks consistent with Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Checklist.

ii. Please prepare more detailed information on how key environmental and social risks will be addressed through mitigation measures integrated into the project design, especially in Component 1 and 2, during the PPG.

iii. Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to integration of traditional and local governance, traditional and local knowledge and capacity building for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the project during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

June 6, 2026

Apologies for overlook - the overall risk rate has been changed.

May 26, 2026

b) The political/governance risk has been changed to substantial, and reinforced with an explanation about forth coming elections in 2026 which may result in a shift of national priorities (p.35).

c) As suggested, the environmental and social risks have been revised (p.37).

ii) It is noted with thanks the recommendation to i) prepare more detailed information on how key environmental and social risks will be addressed; and ii) incorporating monitoring indicators related to integration of traditional and local governance, traditional and local knowledge and capacity building for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the project during the PPG phase.

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
06/03/2026

c) Cleared.

05/19/2026

- a) Yes cleared. The project will be transformative by improvement of policies and regulations for BD and improvement of practices in productive sectors.
- b) The project can be scaled up in other communities.
- c) Not cleared. See comment above on impact at national level. Please improve and clarify work on planification to have more impacts at national level.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Please, refer to response under 5.1 (component 1) - the project will seek to address policy coherence, environmental regulations and planning as they relate to addressing biodiversity loss and land degradation at regional and national level. The project will conduct national policy analysis during PPG to identify inconsistent policies or bad incentives, but also how planning can support and enhance biodiversity conservation and land restoration (p.22).

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
05/19/2026

Cleared. The project is aligned with BD FA objective 1.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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
05/16/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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
05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments
05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks
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
5/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

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
05/19/2026

Cleared

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks
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
05/19/2026

Cleared.

We are welcoming the cofinancing from IFAD of \$29,571,000 USD. We may easily see the added value of a GEF project on the top of this investment. This needs to be confirmed at CEO approval.

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
05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
June 07, 2026

As requested, a new LoE has been provided that includes the footnote.

May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments
May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

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

Secretariat's Comments
06/10/2026

Cleared.

06/03/2026

Not cleared. The comment on the footnote has not been addressed. Please provide a letter with such a footnote, or obtain a confirmation email from the OFP agreeing to this condition.

05/19/2026

Not cleared.

- The LOE is missing the footnote subject the designated executing entity to capacity assessment by the GEF Agency. Please obtain a confirmation email from the OFP agreeing to this condition, or a revised LOE with such footnote.

- There is a difference between the LoE and the table in the portal. Please correct the portal to be consistent with the LoE

Sources of Funds for Country Star Allocation

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Sources of Funds	Total(\$)
IFAD	GET	Cabo Verde	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	3,169,937.00
IFAD	GET	Cabo Verde	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,649,129.00
Total GEF Resources					4,819,066.00

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	Total
GEF TF	IFAD	BD Star Allocation	2,795,915	265,612	99,000	9,410	3,166,937
GEF TF	IFAD	CC Star Allocation	1,455,287	138,252	51,000	4,590	1,649,129
Total GEF Resources			4,251,202	403,864	150,000	14,000	4,819,066

Agency's Comments addressed

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

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

06/10/2026

Cleared.

06/03/2026

Not cleared. The comments has not been addressed. Please precise the probable targeted areas in the 4 islands with geographical coordinates.

05/19/2026

Not cleared. Please provide a map with more details on targeted areas in each island. Please, complete the needed information following the template for geographical coordinates.

Agency's Comments

09/06/2026

Geo-locations are now added.

May 26, 2026

The comment is noted with thanks ? exact areas for project activities will be clarified during PPG after baseline studies, additional consultations with stakeholder consultations in light of government LD and BD priorities in the country. At PIF stage, the target Islands (Fogo, Santiago, Santo Ant?o and S?o Nicolau) have been identified and prioritized.

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

05/19/2026

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

May 26, 2026

Clearance noted with thanks

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/03/2026

Cleared.

05/19/2026

Not cleared.

- CCM score of 1 is inconsistent with the GHG claim. The project claims 449,728 tCO₂e in GHG mitigation (CI 6), which is a substantial figure that suggests climate change mitigation is more than a secondary objective. A score of 1 (significant objective) is difficult to reconcile with a mitigation claim of this scale. Please either justify why CCM remains a secondary objective, for example, if the GHG figure is a co-benefit of restoration activities primarily designed for BD/LD goals, or revise the CCM marker to 2 (principal objective) and ensure distinct activities are attributed to it.
- CCA score of 1 warrants clarification. The project title explicitly references "Resilient Agriculture" and the rationale foregrounds climate vulnerability as a primary driver. Please clarify why CCA is scored as a significant rather than principal objective or confirm that adaptation is fully embedded as a principal design element and revise the marker accordingly.

Agency's Comments

- the CCM marker remains at 1 because the GHG figure is a co-benefit of restoration activities primarily designed for BD/LD goals. This explanation was included in the PIF core indicators section.

- the marker was revised to 2 as adaptation is fully embedded as principal design element.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

06/03/2026

Cleared.

05/19/2026

Not cleared. Please complete

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

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/10/2026

All the comments have been addressed. The project is ready for technical clearance.

06/03/2026

The project is not ready. Please address the comments.

05/19/2026

The project is not ready. Please address the comments.

Agency's Comments

June 07, 2026

The team thanks the reviewer for the thorough review which has helped to increase the overall quality of the document. Efforts have been made to respond to the review at PIF stage. More information and clarity will be provided at PPG stage.

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

Secretariat's Comments

05/22/2023

- Gender

Please ensure that the findings from the gender analysis informs the preparation of the Gender Action Plan and that key elements of the GAP are reflected in the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to

include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

- Please, see potential synergy with other GEF projects as the GEFID 11100, 10871, and especially the 10863 with FAO on Land Degradation Neutrality.

- Risks:

- i. Please prepare more detailed information on how key environmental and social risks will be addressed through mitigation measures integrated into the project design, especially in Component 1 and 2, during the PPG.

- ii. Please consider incorporating monitoring indicators related to integration of traditional and local governance, traditional and local knowledge and capacity building for Indigenous Peoples and local communities in the project during the PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/20/2026	5/29/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/3/2026	6/9/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		