

Strengthening land use planning for sustainable land management

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12302
Countries
Guyana
Project Name
Strengthening land use planning for sustainable land management
Agencies
CI
Date received by PM
3/11/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Juan Hoffmaister
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
May - Cleared

March 2026: The MSP project is eligible with the project's multi-focal area scope spanning Land Degradation (LD) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA). Please reclassify the project as SCCF-A, not B

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

The project was reclassified to SSCF-A.

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 The project objective is well stated, please strengthen to make the objective to more explicitly acknowledge the dual-purpose LD + CCA scope.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

The project summary was adjusted to indicate addressing land degradation to the objective of the project.

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

March 2026: a) Please revise to sharpen and better anchor the results framework and allow more meaningful assessment of whether the project's 48-month scope and \$1.3M GEF budget are proportionate to the stated ambition. The LD focal area dimension is subordinated to the climate resilience framing in a way that does not reflect the dual GET/LD and SCCF-B financing structure. Please revise the objective to specify the target regions and primary sectors, and to give explicit weight to land degradation neutrality alongside climate resilience.

b) The project is exclusively technical assistance with limited field-based investment component. All three components are designated as Technical Assistance in the project overview table. GEF practice, particularly for LD-funded projects, requires at least one component that is linked to field-based action, even where this is combined with TA. Land degradation projects derive their credibility and their LD core indicator performance from on-the-ground SLM implementation, not from plans and capacity building alone.

It is not clear which component delivers the 598,700 ha of land under SLM, or how. Core Indicator 2 (SCCF) targets 598,700 ha of land managed for climate resilience, and the core indicators narrative references this figure in the context of regional land use plans. There is no output that describes who will implement SLM activities on the ground, in which landscapes, using which practices, supported by what financing or institutional mechanism, and on what timeline. The 50 ha SLM demonstration figure mentioned in the core indicators narrative is the only on-the-ground reference

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

a) Thank you for the suggestion. The project components were revised and the following changes were made:

Revised text and indicators to reflect target region as: the updating of the National land use plan targets all 10 Administrative Regions. The specific regional land use plans are Administrative Regions 3 and 4, and updating regional land use plans for Regions 1, 2, 6, 9 (sub-region 1), 10 and Linden- Lethem Highway Corridor. Revised objective has been modified, as well as the project framework table and the project description section to address GEF recommendation including target regions, primary sectors and mention LDN. Pilot SLM work will also be implemented in Region 10 under the output 2.4

Revised project narrative to reflect land use planning impacts all key sectors, agriculture, forestry, tourism, mining, oil and gas, and infrastructure development among others based on land use assessment.

The project aims to achieve measurable progress toward land degradation neutrality through the restoration and sustainable use of degraded lands and enhancing climate resilience and adaptation measures, by analysing vulnerable, high-risk areas to development.

Land degradation neutrality is prioritized alongside climate resilience, recognizing SLM as a shared mechanism for delivering both environmental restoration and adaptation outcomes.

SLM is fundamental to addressing land degradation and mitigating the impacts of climate change. Degraded land resulting from loss of vegetation cover accelerates climate change.

By supporting the conservation of natural resources, biological sequestration is sustained with the storage of carbon absorbed during photosynthesis.

This project supports the sustainable use of land and other resources with rational land use planning and adaptation measures to address the risks from climate change which exacerbates degradation. This is in line with GEF LDFA, specifically with the objective 4 on Improving the enabling policy and institutional framework for LDN, and its sub component ii. Further develop the institutional and regulatory framework and build capacity.

B) Considering the scope and budget of the project, a pilot was included as a project output (see output 2.5). Also, please consider that Component 2 seeks to enhance capacities to produce participatory and integrated land use planning that integrates flood, drought, sea level and climate projections while avoiding, reducing and reversing land degradation. This component would deliver SLM local area interventions across targeted landscapes, including coastal agricultural zones, riverine systems, and forest-agriculture interface areas. These SLM interventions would promote the adoption of climate-resilient and biological sequestration from land restoration practices. They will be demonstrated directly through the project in a pilot site and indirectly through the broader implementation of the land use plans.

The outputs would be implemented in close collaboration with land users and relevant agencies. Financing would be provided through this project, leveraging investments from recently implemented initiatives to utilize existing infrastructure, trained farmers, and other technical and institutional resources, thereby enhancing efficiency, scalability, and sustainability of SLM practices. Current institutional mechanism such as partnerships with agricultural extension services and programs for land reclamation for the implementation of the LCDS by the forest and mining sectors would support the SLM intervention on the ground. This model serves as a

demonstration activity to miners, farmers and communities on the use of degraded lands and marginal areas for productive uses and / or conservation areas.

The indicators have been adjusted to reflect 60,000ha of direct impact, delivered primarily through a pilot site implemented under Component 2 of the project. The remainder of the impact will be realized indirectly through the mainstreaming and implementation of the land use plans produced in the project. Please see below our answer regarding the indicators to be reported.

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

Secretariat's Comments

March 2026: Gender: Please consider including a gender-responsive indicator outcome statement and further elaboration of ESS-identified structural barriers facing women (land tenure constraints, care responsibilities) for future stages. At PIF stage, the GEF Gender Policy requires the incorporation of gender perspectives in the project description and relevant project components, such as in Output 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, among others.

Once at PPG Stage, in the development of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan, please ensure that the activities developed are included in the project documents, and that the GAP aligns with the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the 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.

Knowledge management cleared.

M&E is budgeted at \$66,307 (5.0% of GEF financing)

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Language added to outputs and indicators to strengthen gender responsiveness. Outputs 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, and 3.2 were modified to include appropriate focus on gender and vulnerable groups. An indicator focused on the representation and inclusion of gender and vulnerable groups in the land use planning processes was also added.

During the PPG phase a Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP), which will include a gender analysis, will be developed. The activities will be part of the project document and the GMP will be aligned with the project components. Provisions will be made for the GMP to be fully integrated in the project's implementation including budget, monitoring, PIRs, MTRs and TEs.

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 It is unclear if Components 1 and 2 are sufficient given the comments above on limited resources beyond technical assistance.

Agency's Comments
CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

The scope of the components were adjusted in the PIF document and portal.

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
May 2026: Cleared

March 2026: a) The situation analysis is substantive and well-referenced, clearly describing climate trends (temperature rise, sea level rise, flooding, drought), land degradation drivers (mining, agriculture, forestry, oil and gas), and their interaction. Suggest to strengthen the systems perspective by including linkages between drivers, feedbacks, and ecosystem service dependencies more.

b) Barriers are identified but conflated with symptoms. A clearer barrier/enabler matrix could strengthen the theory of change foundation

Agency's Comments
CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

a) Thank you for the suggestion. We complemented the systems perspective. Please revise PIF document section A. Project rationale, where it is stated that climate drivers interact with land use pressures to create reinforcing feedback loops that accelerate land degradation and climate vulnerability.

b) Please review section 3. Key System Drivers? were the barriers that the project is tackling were clarified. A matrix was added for additional clarity.

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

May 2026: Cleared

March 2026:

a) Please include a brief comparative analysis of alternative approaches. Given the selection of integrated land use planning as the intervention modality, please elaborate why this approach, vs other options such as sector-specific regulation, etc

b) Cleared

c) Previous investments are catalogued in Table 3. We encourage to draw on any lessons learned where possible in the next phase.

d) Cleared

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

a) Baseline understanding and projects, stating that land use planning is the most effective approach for delivering systemic, multi-sectoral, and participatory interventions that achieve both land degradation neutrality and climate resilience, while also enhancing critical ecosystem services such as soil stability, water regulation, and carbon storage.

Alternative approaches, while valuable in specific contexts, are limited in scale, integration, and ability to address issues of climate drivers and land degradation.

c) Noted. This will be revised at 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

May 2026: (The project description has virtually no details on the project components. This should be improved at PPG. Re the specific SLM (Output 2.5) details are also missing on proposed SLM activities which could be implemented at the pilot site to achieve the intended targets. It also does not include any training or capacity building activities with farmers to increase the uptake of SLM practices going forward. In addition, and in relation to this, is there a role for farmers associations or CBOs to provide continued support? We expect this and other details in the project description to be further clarified and explained, briefly at this stage and in further detail at PPG.

Additionally, please include collaboration with WOCAT for knowledge sharing on SLM interventions.

March 2026: a) A ToC narrative and diagram is coherent, but the causal logic between plan preparation and actual land management outcomes to justifies the 598,700 ha core indicator target needs strengthening. The theory of change needs an explicit step between "plans are

prepared" and "land management improves." Right now there's a missing middle (who implements the plans, what incentives or regulatory mechanisms drive adoption, what happens in the 48-month project window versus what happens post-project. The revised ToC should articulate a realistic pathway that acknowledges the project's primary contribution is enabling (plans, capacity, coordination) while identifying the specific mechanisms through which this translates to measurable landscape outcomes)

Additionally, please articulate the full SCCF adaptation causal chain (hazard, impact, intervention, adaptation result) further. The current connection between climate hazards and land use planning responses remains implicit and needs to be made explicit to justify SCCF-A financing.

During the PPG stage, please differentiate adaptation content by region, recognizing that coastal, interior, and corridor areas face distinct climate risk profiles. The planning methodology should not apply a uniform approach across regions with heterogeneous climate vulnerabilities, and include that this will be done in the revised version.

b) Outputs are defined but Component 2 outputs are overly numerous for the available budget, and the field-based action required to deliver LD and adaptation results remains needs to be strengthen across all components.

Agency's Comments **CI-GEF May 20, 2026:**

Within the project description there is a subsection of Theory of Change and below it, there is a subsection on project components. We take not to describe those in the ppg phase.

Under the description of component 2, language added to further describe the type of SLM activities to be carried out at the demonstration site. The role and involvement of farmers and CBOs were also clarified and expanded in section 4. Stakeholder Engagement and Participation.

The World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) would provide a standardized method to document the implementation on sustainable land management practices achieved under the project, and would provide the knowledge sharing for enhancing capacities and imparting details of the approaches and/ or technologies utilised, valuable for replication and scaling up projects. Furthermore, WOCAT is recognised by the UNCCD as a recommended Global Database for SLM best practices which demonstrates the implementation work of countries and would contribute to Guyana's national report to the Convention. This was added under the description of component 3.

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

a) We addressed this comment in the ToC section, stating that implementation of the land use plans will be operationalized through existing national and sectoral frameworks, ensuring alignment with established strategies, policies, plans, programmes, and projects existing at governmental and non-governmental agencies and key stakeholders. Land use planning is a participatory process during which consultations and the Planning Steering Committee shape the preparation of the land use plans.

The national and regional land use plans will function as overarching spatial frameworks that guide sectoral planning and investment decisions across key areas such as agriculture, forestry, mining, infrastructure, and environmental management. The national land use plan (2013) is available for free, online with all national maps. The National land use data is freely available to anyone requesting its use for national benefits to the country. In this regards, the national land use plan is utilized by entities and investors which supports its implementation. Regional land use plans are available on request, along with the datasets.

In practice, the plans will be implemented through sector strategies led by relevant government agencies and supported by development partners. Annual work programmes, regulatory processes, and project pipelines ensuring that land allocation, permitting, and development activities are consistent with land capability, climate risk considerations, and sustainable land management (SLM) principles contained in land use plans.

The Guyana Lands and Surveys Commission will coordinate the overall process in partnership with Conservation International (Guyana) during the project implemented. The land use planning process would be supported by a multi-stakeholder Planning Steering Committee comprising land management agencies, non-governmental organizations, Indigenous representatives, private sector actors, and academia. This structure ensures inclusive decision-making, cross-sectoral coordination, and accountability in implementation.

Operationalization will be further supported through:

- The methodology for land use planning, land allocation criteria provided by agencies, land use projections from sectors, and development control from land agencies would be aligned with the plans;
- Capacity building and technical support to agencies and land users to apply SLM practices and climate risk-informed planning;
- Pilot and demonstration interventions in priority landscapes to translate plans into on-the-ground actions; and
- Monitoring and Implementation framework provide reporting to track implementation and progress toward land degradation neutrality and climate resilience targets.

Through this approach, land use plans move beyond strategic and advisory documents to become actionable tools guiding sustainable land management and climate-resilient development across Guyana.

On the SCCF causal chain, information added to the project rationale section to clarify the causal chain and make the connection between the climate hazards and land use planning to deliver.

Thank you for the suggestion. During the PPG phase we will ensure to differentiate adaptation content per region.

b) Component 2 outputs have been reframed to include a field-based SLM demonstration action. The project will deliver direct impact on the ground in the demonstration and indirectly through the implementation of land use plans
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

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 CommentsCleared.

Agency's Comments

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

May 2026: The GEBs are really ambitious. Target under sub-indicator 4.3 is quite ambitious; however, it is welcomed if it can be backed up by future implementation of the land use plans, e.g. through government programs and/or future investment projects. There should be evidence of this in the co-financing. The GEBs are quite high and there is no real co-financing (all in kind at the moment). How will these targets be achieved?

March 2026: a) The 598,700 ha under Core Indicator 2 (SCCF) and Core Indicator 4 (LD) appear derived from the aggregate area covered by regional land use plans rather than direct SLM intervention. Given the project's AFOLU focus, consider targeting GHG emissions reduction through indicator 6

b) Targets are not reasonable as currently structured. Only 50 ha will receive direct SLM intervention; the remaining 598,650 ha reflects plan coverage, not managed land. Per GEF methodology, 50 ha should be recorded under Core Indicator 4.3 (land under improved management through direct intervention) and the balance, under Core Indicator 4.1 (land under improved management through indirect influence of plans and policies). This distinction must be explicitly applied and documented. No LD core indicators are populated

c) Please add adaptation-specific indicators under Core Indicator 2 that measure reduced vulnerability or increased adaptive capacity, such as people with reduced climate exposure through improved zoning or hectares under climate-resilient land management. Current indicators lean heavily on LD outcomes.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 20, 2026:

Implementation of the plans will be financed through the annual budgets of relevant state agencies with land management mandates, and special projects as appropriate. More details on this will be provided at the PPG phase and project goals will be refined.

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

- a) Thank you for the suggestion. We will assess in the ppg phase if GEF core indicator 6 can be reported.
- b) The Core indicators were clarified. 60,000 ha will be impacted directly through a demonstration site (GEF core indicator 4.3), and the remainder of impact indirectly through the mainstreaming and implementation of the land use plans (GEF core indicator 4.1).
- c) We added a project goal for Core Indicator 2, specifically under (a) Area of land managed for climate resilience (ha).

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

May 2026: OP to advise

March 2026: Innovation dimension: Institutional & Policy risk, the narrative doesn't address innovation risk elements. Consider removing or focusing on innovative aspects, e.g. risk associated with the new national land use plan

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Risks associated with a new national land use plan has been included in the risk section

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

May 2026: Regarding policy alignment, the national Drought Mitigation and Adaptation Plan is listed, which is also posted on the UNCCD website (<https://www.unccd.int/land-and-life/drought/drought-planning>). The project is encouraged to explore alignment and synergies with this plan when developing land use plans.

March 2026: a) Please describe how climate resilience criteria will be embedded in the land use planning methodology under Component 1, including climate risk screening, vulnerability mapping as a spatial input layer, and adaptation-relevant decision rules for land use allocation.

b) Scaling potential exists through the regional plan replication methodology. Please include possible pathways from pilot to national scale in revised version.

c) Alignment with LCDS 2030, NDC, and UNCCD NAP commitments. Please strengthen the operational linkage between project outputs and Guyana's LCDS 2030, NDC, and NAP adaptation commitments by clarifying whether regional land use plans will become formal instruments within the national adaptation planning architecture.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 20, 2026:

Thank you. We will explore alignment and synergies with the plan when the land use plans are developed, and we will explore this in more detail in the PPG phase.

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

a) Added language to the description of Component 1 for embedding climate resilience criteria in land use planning. .

b) Component 2 outputs and description were adjusted, to describe how on-the-ground impacts will be delivered through the implementation of the plans.

c) Project description section, specifically under the ToC has been strengthened to demonstrate strong operational alignment with Guyana's key policy frameworks. It was included in a section on operational Linkages, and Institutional Integration. The later states that national and regional land use plans would be utilized for future decisions and to inform policies for national adaptation planning. This ensures that project outputs become embedded within national policy and planning systems, enabling long-term sustainability and impact.

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 CommentsCleared

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

Alignment with LDFA: Majority of the GEFTF funding is aligned LD1-4 on enabling activity support towards achieving LDN. Please consider.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Thank you for the suggestion. The project financial lines were modified to report under LD-4.

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

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

The stakeholder consultation list is extensive, Based on the list of stakeholders consulted in the preparation of the PIF and the stakeholders who may have a role in implementation, it is not clear whether small famers have been consulted and what their role will be in implementation. As a key stakeholder please include. A similar comment applies to the private sector (beyond small farmers).

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Small farmers and the private sector were not directly consulted in the development of the PIF. However, their interests were represented though inputs from previous projects and engagements. Direct consultation with farmers and the private sector will be carried out in the PPG phase.

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 CommentsOP to advise

Agency's Comments

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 CommentsPlease change to SCCF-A

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

This was modified for the project to request resources from SCCF-A
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsPlease remove SCCF-B

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Adjusted

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 CommentsCleared

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 CommentsCleared

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's CommentsCleared

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsCleared

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 CommentsCleared

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments

May 2026: The indication of participatory approaches is welcome however quite general. Please expand on the role of these different stakeholders and how they may be involved in the enabling activities as well as in the field-based interventions.

March 2026: We note that CI has attached Preliminary ESMS Screening. An overall ESS risk is classified as Low.

1. PIF mentioned that "Output 2.5 ? Integrated regional land use plan for region 3 and 4 and regional land use plans for region 1, 2, 6, 9 (sub-region 1), 10 and Linden Lethem Road Corridor and Soesdyke-Linden Corridor, addressing land degradation neutrality and climate change adaptation and mitigation are prepared and led by a multidisciplinary task force with active and informed participation of stakeholders, in particular of Women, Youth and Indigenous Peoples?". Please clarify whether the project will engage with Indigenous Peoples.
2. Please clarify how the project consulted with Indigenous Peoples and local communities, small scale farmers and other vulnerable populations about project concept (PIF), particularly related to Component 1 and 2, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project concept (PIF).
3. Please ensure identifying and engaging wide range of stakeholders using target project areas including seasonal and temporary users of the areas during PPG. Please also ensure conducting thorough consultations with key stakeholders and developing robust mitigation measures including alternative livelihoods for key stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples and local communities based on consultations during PPG.
4. Please also ensure integrating mitigation measures and environmental and social action plans as a part of project activities (particularly Component 2) with clear budget and timeline during PPG.
5. Please ensure the project obtained free, prior and informed consent (FPIC) from Indigenous Peoples about project design during PPG and throughout project implementation and monitoring, if the project areas used or occupied by Indigenous Peoples.
6. Please consider Indigenous Peoples and local communities as partners of the project particularly Component 2.
7. Please consider integrating Indigenous Peoples and local communities' governance, traditional and local knowledge, capacity building as a part of the project, particularly in Component 2.
8. 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 PPG.

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 20, 2026:

Specific roles will be identified and defined during PPG phase and a Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) detailing these roles will be presented as part of the CEO ER package. Roles of key stakeholders on both enabling activities and field-based interventions will be defined at PPG

where a stakeholder engagement plan will be developed for PPG specifically, including engagements with local landowners involved in mapping and validation of interventions.

CI-GEF May 04, 2026

1. Added language to the outputs and indicators. The outputs under component 2 were revised resulting in changes to the numbering. The project will engage with Indigenous People primarily through the land use planning processes in all regions, especially those with a significant population of indigenous people.
2. Direct consultations were not conducted with IPLCs, small farmers and other vulnerable groups in the preparation of the PIF. However, Indigenous perspectives were included from the National Toshihaos? Council and input from other groups included from previous engagements. These groups will be directly consulted during the PPG phase.
3. Noted. The project will identify and robustly consult with all groups relevant groups, including IPLCs and small farmers during the PPG phase.
4. Noted. Language was added to the risk matrix indicating that the project will develop environmental and social safeguards action plans with budgets and timelines during the PPG, building on safeguards screening completed during the preparation of the PIF.
5. Noted. The Free Prior and Informed Consent of IPLCs will be appropriately sought during the PPG Phase.
6. Noted. IPLCs are project partners.
7. Noted. IPLC culture and traditional knowledge will play key roles in the project, particularly in the execution of Component 2.
8. Noted. This will be included in the PPG Phase.

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments Please revise: CCA (principal), LD (principal), and BD (significant given biodiversity co-benefits referenced in Section B)

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Adjusted

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

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

Please see comments marked for May 2026

March: Kindly address comments in a revised draft

Agency's Comments

CI-GEF May 20, 2026:

Thank you for your comments, they have been addressed in the portal and in the updated PIF document.

CI-GEF May 04, 2026:

Thank you for the feedback. All the comments have been addressed.

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	3/28/2026	5/5/2026
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2026	5/20/2026

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)