



Integration of Natural Capital Accounting Into Lesotho's Policy And Decision Making For Sustainable Development

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10979

Countries

Lesotho

Project Name

Integration of Natural Capital Accounting Into Lesotho's Policy And Decision Making For Sustainable Development

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/13/2022

Review completed by PM

6/14/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please:

-further refine the link between the NCAA and the target policy decision, i.e. watershed management in the Upper Senqu catchment. The specific policy question and instrument (e.g. watershed management plan) that is targeted will have to be clearly defined, and the project's approach to improve watershed management in practice through NCAA will have to be detailed.

- reconsider execution arrangements,, especially to give a prominent execution role to the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning, which will be key for this project. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.

JS 6/15/2022 - Thank you for the revisions and responses throughout this review sheet. Previous comments are cleared.

A- The execution agencies shown in the first page of the portal entry are different from the executing partners endorsed by the OFP in its LoE (Ministry of (i) Water; (ii)

Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation; and (iii) Tourism, Environment and Culture).
Please:

- either revert in the portal entry to the executing partners shown in the LoE. The execution will then be changed as necessary during PPG, especially to give a prominent execution role to the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning, which will be key for this project. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.

- or provide with the resubmission an email or new LoE from the OFP supporting the new execution arrangements presented in the PIF.

During PPG, please further refine the link between the NCAA and the target policy decision, i.e. watershed management in the Upper Senqu catchment. The specific policy question and instrument (e.g. watershed management plan) that is targeted will have to be clearly defined, and the project's approach to improve watershed management in practice through NCAA will have to be detailed.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1-Thank you for the submission of this MSP. As stated in the GEF-7 BD FA strategy, GEF-7 NCAA projects "will design and link the NCAA exercises to respond to specific target decisions or policy questions to help ensure their practical relevance as well as the institutionalization and use of NCAA for the medium- and long-term". This MSP currently fails to link the NCAA it will develop to any specific target decisions or policy questions. Rather, it seems to present NCAA as an end in itself. There is only one output (2.1.3) that, according to the alternative scenario, "will explore the application of NCAA to inform management and spatial planning of a specific watershed".

Please revise in particular component 2 to outline a precise practical or policy decision the project will work on. This involves explaining the relevance of that decision, its baseline, and how the project will concretely influence it. The relevance of NCAA for that particular decision should notably be detailed, as well as the timeliness of the project compared to when the decision is to take place, and how the key decision makers would be involved in the project, from shaping the NCAA analyses, getting project support in the actual decision-making, maybe also to its implementation, to ideally, benefiting from a NCAA-based monitoring framework for the implementation of the decision. Outlining a precise practical or policy decision to be targeted by the project will also entail adding explicit criteria related to policy relevance for the site(s) selection

to be made during PPG. We also suggest strengthening component 2 at the expense of other components to emphasize learning by doing and communicating/raising awareness on an application of practical relevance.

2-Given the project's interventions, please tag the full project amount under BD-1-3.

Agency Response

<p>JS 6/15/2022 ?</p> <p>- Thank you for the revisions and responses throughout this review sheet. Previous comments are cleared.</p> <p>A- The execution agencies shown in the first page of the portal entry are different from the executing partners endorsed by the OFP in its LoE (Ministry of (i) Water; (ii) Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation; and (iii) Tourism, Environment and Culture). Please:</p> <p>- either revert in the portal entry to the executing partners shown in the LoE. The execution will then be changed as necessary during PPG, especially to give a prominent execution role to the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning, which will be key for this project. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.</p> <p>- or provide with the resubmission an email or new LoE from the OFP supporting the new execution arrangements presented in the PIF.</p> <p>During PPG, please further refine the link between the NCAA and the target policy decision, i.e. watershed management in the Upper Senqu catchment. The specific policy question and instrument (e.g. watershed management plan) that is targeted will have to be clearly defined, and the project's approach to improve watershed management in practice through NCAA will have to be detailed.</p>	<p>Thank you for the further constructive feedback provided.</p> <p>To harmonize the discrepancy in execution agencies between the LoE and the PIF we suggest to follow the first option. Therefore, the executing partners in the portal have been revised to ?the Ministry of Water, Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation and Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture? as reflected in the LOE.</p> <p>During PPG necessary changes will be made to rectify this and give the BOS its due prominent role.</p> <p>Agreed. During the PPG phase the link between NCAA and watershed management in the Upper Senqu Catchment will be further refined, with a more detailed definition of the specific policy question and related tools targeted and with more information how the project will intend to improve the present watershed management practice with help of the additional information provided by the NCAA approach chosen.</p>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

JS 5/2/2022 -

1-Thank you for the submission of this MSP. As stated in the GEF-7 BD FA strategy, GEF-7 NCAA projects "will design and link the NCAA exercises to respond to specific target decisions or policy questions to help ensure their practical relevance as well as the institutionalization and use of NCAA for the medium- and long-term". This MSP currently fails to link the NCAA it will develop to any specific target decisions or policy questions. Rather, it seems to present NCAA as an end in itself. There is only one output (2.1.3) that, according to the alternative scenario, "will explore the application of NCA to inform management and spatial planning of a specific watershed".

Please revise in particular component 2 to outline a precise practical or policy decision the project will work on. This involves explaining the relevance of that decision, its baseline, and how the project will concretely influence it.

The relevance of NCAA for that particular decision should notably be detailed, as well as the timeliness of the project compared to when the decision is to take place, and how the key decision makers would be involved in the project, from shaping the NCAA analyses, getting project support in the actual decision-making, maybe also to its implementation, to ideally, benefiting from an NCAA-based monitoring framework for the implementation of the decision.

Outlining a precise practical or policy decision to be targeted by the project will also entail adding explicit criteria related to policy relevance for the site(s) selection to be made during PPG. We also suggest strengthening component 2 at the expense of other components to emphasize learning by doing and communicating/raising awareness on an application of practical relevance.

response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022

This project is aiming at mainstreaming natural capital through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho into integrated watershed management. The project formulation has therefore been revised accordingly.

Component 2 has been revised into 3 distinct outputs to support the precise practical or policy decision for a distinct watershed management approach in the Upper Senqu catchment.

The first output will establish land and water accounts for the Upper Senqu water catchment, the second output aims at making use of water and land accounts to design operational strategies and guide integrated water management policy for the Upper Senqu catchment.

The 3rd output aims at conducting a policy dialogue with key stakeholders on mainstreaming of NC through the use of NCA in integrated watershed management.

The main issue and policy decision of the project in Lesotho is to enable the government to make sustainable watershed management decisions, through use of SEEA-based natural capital accounts capturing the eco-hydrological ecosystem services provided by the terrestrial ecosystem (forest, savannah, grassland). This will enable the resource managers to consider the role and importance of these terrestrial ecosystems on the quality and quantity of the water resources in the basin.

In the baseline scenario, as defined in the problem definition section as business-as-usual scenario, the government authorities will continue to make conventional water resource management decisions without understanding and capturing the role of the terrestrial ecosystem.

In the alternative scenario section and the section on the innovativeness of the project, we have highlighted that the project will support and build capacity of the resource managers on recognizing, quantifying and capturing the contribution of the terrestrial ecosystem services on water resources so that conservation and restoration of these ecosystems will be integrated into water resource planning.

We provided additional information about how NCA is relevant and linked with the decision processes and how the key decision makers will be part of this process. In this process:

The NCA will be based on SEEA-EA methodology. Therefore, it will include ecosystem extent, condition, supply and use account. Therefore, the NCA tool may be used in different use cases, which need to be detailed at the PPG phase. However, the extent accounts will surely be developed, which can be linked with any land use activity.

Since the supply and use accounts will be developed, the resource management and irrigation

2-Given the project's interventions, please tag the full project amount under BD-1-3.

response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022
Agreed. The full amount has now been tagged under BD-1-3 NCAA in both the PIF and the portal

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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/16/2022 -

A- The new submission did not correct the syntax but rather changed the meaning and introduced typos in table B. The new project objective and outcome 2.1 put natural capital valuation has an end in itself, when as already commented on in previous reviews, it should be, as per the GEF-7 BD strategy, a means to the end of mainstreaming natural capital in decision making.

Please correct to: "To mainstream natural capital into integrated watershed management through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho"; "Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA".

2. Mainstreaming natural capital valuation through application of NCA in integrated watershed management	Technical Assistance	2.1 Natural capital valuation mainstreamed through application of NCA into integrated watershed management
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

JS 6/15/2022 -

A- Please correct the syntax of the project objective and outcome 2.1 : "To mainstream natural capital into integrated watershed management through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho"; "Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA".

All the rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1-Please revise the project objective: (i) the objective should not be to mainstream NCA per se but to mainstream natural capital/biodiversity through NCAA, and (ii) as outcome 2.1 is "NCA mainstreamed into spatial planning and development frameworks", the project objective should go beyond just "establishing enabling condition".

2-Please also consider revising component and outcome formulations to make clear that NCA is a means to the end of NC/biodiversity mainstreaming, and not an end in itself.

3- There is no proportionality between GEF funded and co-financed PMC. 10% of GEF project financing is devoted to PMC when only 7.5% of co-finance is allocated to it. Please ensure proportionality.

Agency Response

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

JS 6/16/2022 -

A- The new submission did not correct the syntax but rather changed the meaning and introduced typos in table B. The new project objective and outcome 2.1 put natural capital valuation as an end in itself, when as already commented on in previous reviews, it should be, as per the GEF-7 BD strategy, a means to the end of mainstreaming natural capital in decision making.

Please correct to: "To mainstream natural capital into integrated watershed management through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho"; "Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA".

We have revised the project objective to read as "To mainstream watershed management through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho"

Component 2: Mainstreaming natural capital through application of NCA in integrated watershed management

Also revised outcome 2.1 to read as "Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA"

We are not able to see the syntax error on the portal in our side, but we have corrected the project objective and the project outcome as per the screen shot below

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective

To mainstream natural capital into integrated watershed management through application of NCA in Lesotho

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective

To mainstream natural capital into integrated watershed management through application of NCA in Lesotho

2. Mainstreaming natural capital through application of NCA in integrated watershed management	TA	2.1 Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA.	2.1.1 Establishment of water and land accounts for Upper Senqu Catchment 2.1.2 Making use of water and land accounts to design operational strategies and guide integrated water catchment policy for the Upper Senqu Catchment 2.1.3 Policy dialogue conducted with key stakeholders on mainstreaming of natural capital through the use of NCA in integrated watershed management	GET	533
2. Mainstreaming natural capital through application of NCA in integrated watershed management	TA	2.1 Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA.	2.1.1 Establishment of water and land accounts for Upper Senqu Catchment 2.1.2 Making use of water and land accounts to design operational strategies and guide integrated water catchment policy for the Upper Senqu Catchment 2.1.3 Policy dialogue conducted with key stakeholders on mainstreaming of natural capital through the use of NCA in integrated watershed management	GET	533

<p>JS 6/15/2022 -</p> <p>A- Please correct the syntax of the project objective and outcome 2.1 : "To mainstream natural capital into integrated watershed management through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho"; "Natural capital mainstreamed into integrated watershed management through application of NCA" .</p> <p>All the rest is cleared, thank you.</p>	<p>This syntax has been corrected in both the PIF and the portal.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>JS 5/2/2022 -</p> <p>1-Please revise the project objective:</p> <p>(i) the objective should not be to mainstream NCA per se but to mainstream natural capital/biodiversity through NCA, and (ii) as outcome 2.1 is "NCA mainstreamed into spatial planning and development frameworks", the project objective should go beyond just "establishing enabling condition".</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>(i)Agreed. The project objective has been rephrased accordingly to read "To mainstream natural capital through application of natural capital accounting in Lesotho into integrated watershed management?"</p> <p>(ii) Outcome 2.1 has been revised to read as "Natural capital mainstreamed through application of NCA into integrated watershed management?"</p>
<p>2-Please also consider revising component and outcome formulations to make clear that NCA is a means to the end of NC/biodiversity mainstreaming, and not an end in itself.</p>	<p>Component 2 has been revised into 3 distinct outputs to support the precise practical or policy decision for a distinct watershed management approach in the Upper Senqu catchment. The first output will establish land and water accounts for the Upper Senqu water catchment, the second output aims at making use of water and land accounts to design operational strategies and guide integrated water management policy for the Upper Senqu catchment. The 3rd output aims at conducting a policy dialogue with key stakeholders on mainstreaming of NC through the use of NCA in integrated watershed management.</p>

3- There is no proportionality between GEF funded and co-financed PMC. 10% of GEF project financing is devoted to PMC when only 7.5% of co-finance is allocated to it. Please ensure proportionality.

Agreed. The PMC co-financing is adjusted to ensure proportionality (ratio 1:3 /GEF 111,685 (10%): co-financing 350,000 (10.5%), in line with this ratio 1:3 for the other components.

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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/13/2022 -

1- Please revise the tagging of UNEP's in-kind co-financing to "recurrent expenditures":

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,500,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	900,000.00
GEF Agency	UNEP (TEEB, SEEA, Regional Office)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	270,000.00

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- "in-kind" co-financing is most typically not "Investment mobilized". Please revise the table, tagging all in-kind as recurrent expenditures:

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Government of Lesotho, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture	In-kind	Investment mobilized	900,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Government of Lesotho, Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation	In-kind	Investment mobilized	2,400,000.00
GEF Agency	UNEP (TEEB, SEEA, Regional Office)	In-kind	Investment mobilized	270,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)				3,570,000.00

2- There seems to be no co-financing from the BSO, at least in-kind, when its involvement is key to advance NCAA. Please explain.

Agency Response

<p>JS 6/13/2022 -</p> <p>1- Please revise the tagging of UNEP's in-kind co-financing to "recurrent expenditures":</p>	<p>Agreed. The tagging has been revised to "recurrent expenditures" in the portal and PIF.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>JS 5/2/2022 ?1- "in-kind" co-financing is most typically not "Investment mobilized". Please revise the table, tagging all in-kind as recurrent expenditures:</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u> Agreed. In the co-financing Table, the in-kind type of co-financing has been revised to "recurrent expenditures".</p>
<p>2- There seems to be no co-financing from the BSO, at least in-kind, when its involvement is key to advance NCAA. Please explain.</p>	<p>This co-financing has been revised. The BOS, as a key stakeholder in this project, is a Department in the Ministry of Development Planning, which is co-financing \$1,000,000.</p>

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 JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response [N/A](#)

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response [N/A](#)

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response [N/A](#)

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

[JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.](#)

[Please refine the targets during PPG.](#)

JS 5/2/2022 -Targets appear small relative to the funding request and it is not clear how the project would have a direct impact over the reported 15,000 ha. Please note that core indicators are meant to capture only the direct impact stemming for the project, including from its co-financing. In the absence of a solid theory of change linking the NCAA to impact on the ground, the provision of information or the development of a plan, without support to its implementation, is not sufficient to claim impact. Revisions to component 2 called for in other comments will likely solve that issue.

1- Please revise the targets accordingly.

2- Please provide an explanation of how the targets were derived under table F, including the assumptions used to derive the number of beneficiaries or the number of ha in the absence of identified target sites at PIF stage.

Agency Response

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared. Please refine the targets during PPG.	Agreed. The targets will be further refined and provided with additional information, where possible, during the PPG phase.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>JS 5/2/2022 ?</p> <p>Targets appear small relative to the funding request and it is not clear how the project would have a direct impact over the reported 15,000 ha. Please note that core indicators are meant to capture only the direct impact stemming for the project, including from its co-financing. In the absence of a solid theory of change linking the NCAA to impact on the ground, the provision of information or the development of a plan, without support to its implementation, is not sufficient to claim impact. Revisions to component 2 called for in other comments will likely solve that issue.</p> <p>1- Please revise the targets accordingly.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>Based on consultations with the stakeholders and a set of selection criteria, the Upper Senqu Catchment has been identified as pilot catchment area. Within this Upper Senqu catchment, based on data availability, two priority sub-catchment have been selected in the Upper Senqu Catchment, which has a total area of 15,064.19 km². The first sub-catchment is named Khubelu, with an area of 27,842ha and 1,104 inhabitants (541F, 563M) and the Senqunyane sub-catchment with 65,679ha and 3,554 inhabitants (1,716F, 1,838M). Although this needs to be further investigated during the PPG, it is suggested to make use of the existing data and focus on these 2 sub-catchments. This would lead to a target of combined 93,521ha for Core Indicator 4, area of landscape under improved practices, and 4,658 direct beneficiaries (2,257F, 2,401M) for Core Indicator 11.</p>
<p>2- Please provide an explanation of how the targets were derived under table F, including the assumptions used to derive the number of beneficiaries or the number of ha in the absence of identified target sites at PIF stage.</p>	<p>With the selection of two sub-catchments, Khubelu and the Senqunyane sub-catchment within the Upper Senqu catchment, this would lead, as explained above, to a target of combined 93,521ha for Core Indicator 4, area of landscape under improved practices, and 4,658 direct beneficiaries (2,257F, 2,401M) for Core Indicator 11. These targets need to be confirmed and further detailed if possible during the PPG process.</p>

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 JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

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

JS 6/13/2022

Cleared.

During PPG, please refine the barrier analysis to identify what are the precise barriers to NCA adoption and practical use to mainstream biodiversity in development planning and management frameworks. The barriers are still for the most part limited to lack of awareness about NCA (with overlaps between barriers 1 and 3) and lack of used of NCA.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- Please clarify the statistics that "*Lesotho, however, has one of the lowest proportions of conservation protected areas of any country in Africa (formal reserves of total 0.261% of land surface).*" The Maloti Drakensberg Conservation and Development Area (WDPA ID 20294) covers, on its own, 20% of Lesotho.

2- Please clarify the root cause and threats the project proposes to address, clearly distinguishing root causes from threats and environmental consequences. There is currently a long development that mixes root causes, threats and their consequences, as reflected in the theory of change's diagram where "reduced vegetation cover" or "water extraction" are considered causes.

3- Please refine the barrier analysis. The lack of adoption of NCA or of its mainstreaming should not be barriers. They are rather the problem the project wants to address. The barrier analysis of such a focused PIF should go one level deeper and outline clearly what are the barrier to NCA adoption and its practical use to mainstream biodiversity in development planning and management frameworks. It is partly just a matter of reformulation and clarification as awareness, technical capacity, data availability, and institutional arrangement are already highlighted.

Agency Response

<p>JS 6/13/2022</p> <p>Cleared.</p> <p>During PPG, please refine the barrier analysis to identify what are the precise barriers to NCA adoption and practical use to mainstream biodiversity in development planning and management frameworks. The barriers are still for the most part limited to lack of awareness about NCA (with overlaps between barriers 1 and 3) and lack of used of NCA.</p>	<p>Agreed. The barrier analysis will be further improved and refined during the PPG phase, defining what are the existing barriers to NCA adoption and its practical use to mainstream biodiversity in development planning and (watershed) management frameworks.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>JS 5/2/2022 ?</p> <p>1- Please clarify the statistics that "<i>Lesotho, however, has one of the lowest proportions of conservation protected areas of any country in Africa (formal reserves of total 0.261% of land surface).</i>" The Maloti Drakensberg Conservation and Development Area (WDPA ID 20294) covers, on its own, 20% of Lesotho.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>The statistics providing the area of formal reserves of 0.261% of land surface are based on relatively recent UNEP-WCMC (2018) data (World Database on protected areas). The Maloti-Drakensberg Conservation and Development Area is indeed covering a total area of 6,324km², which leads to a much larger area of protected area (as suggested about 20%), see also https://www.protectedplanet.net/20294. The Sehlabathebe National Park, part of the Maloti-Drakensberg Park is more limited, with only 6,500ha, and is situated fully in Lesotho as part of the transnational entity. This might explain the divergence in the statistics (see whc.unesco.org/en/list/985). This quote has also been included in the PIF see page 11</p>
<p>2- Please clarify the root cause and threats the project proposes to address, clearly distinguishing root causes from threats and environmental consequences. There is currently a long development that mixes root causes, threats and their consequences, as reflected in the theory of change's diagram where "reduced vegetation cover" or "water extraction" are considered causes.</p>	<p>In addition to the section on environmental challenges for Lesotho, a section has been compiled reflecting the specific challenges, root causes and threats for the chosen pilot area, the Upper Senqu Catchment. Based on this comment, the Theory of Change has been revised</p>

3- Please refine the barrier analysis. The lack of adoption of NCA or of its mainstreaming should not be barriers. They are rather the problem the project wants to address. The barrier analysis of such a focused PIF should go one level deeper and outline clearly what are the barrier to NCA adoption and its practical use to mainstream biodiversity in development planning and management frameworks. It is partly just a matter of reformulation and clarification as awareness, technical capacity, data availability, and institutional arrangement are already highlighted.

Barrier analysis has been revised and reformulated to accommodate the suggested improvements in the analysis - see page ,15 on the barrier analysis section

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/13/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1 - Please consider removing the old projects (e.g. GEF ID 245) and add the following GEF-7 projects to the baseline:

GEF ID 10797 - GEF Sustainable Groundwater Management In SADC Member States Project Phase 2 - World Bank, which will notably improve monitoring capacity, harmonize databases and develop decision support systems related to ground water.

GEF ID 10793 - Building climate-resilient livelihoods and food systems - FAO, which will notably develop decision-support systems for policy-makers and practitioners to assist with the formulation and evaluation of policies and measures for climate-resilient food systems transformations, and also focusses on agricultural water management.

2- Please clarify what is the institutional set-up for SDG monitoring and reporting in Lesotho, in particular the SDG 6, 14 and 15 that are most related to natural capital, and how the projects relate to it.

Agency Response
cleared on 13 June 2022

<p>JS 5/2/2022 -</p> <p>1 - Please consider removing the old projects (e.g. GEF ID 245) and add the following GEF-7 projects to the baseline:</p> <p>GEF ID 10797 - GEF Sustainable Groundwater Management In SADC Member States Project Phase 2 - World Bank, which will notably improve monitoring capacity, harmonize databases and develop decision support systems related to ground water.</p> <p>GEF ID 10793 - Building climate-resilient livelihoods and food systems - FAO, which will notably develop decision-support systems for policy-makers and practitioners to assist with the formulation and evaluation of policies and measures for climate-resilient food systems transformations, and also focusses on agricultural water management.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>Agreed. Some older projects have been removed and the suggested newer GEF-funded projects have been added ? see section 1.2 on the baseline in the PIF</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2- Please clarify what is the institutional set-up for SDG monitoring and reporting in Lesotho, in particular the SDG 6, 14 and 15 that are most related to natural capital, and how the projects relate to it.

The Ministry of Development Planning is coordinating and monitoring the implementation of the SDGs by Government Ministries. The planning units of Ministries are key custodians of SDGs and expected to monitor their sector related units through integrating SDGs with their sector plans.

SDG 6: It is monitored by the Ministry of Water through the focal points responsible for reporting on SDG 6 indicators. Project Outcomes are in consistent with SDG 6. Assessment of ecosystems will enable the country to protect, conserve, and report on SDG implementation.

SDG 14: Lesotho does not report on SDG 14.

SDG 15: The Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) and the Ministry of Tourism Environment and Culture (MTEC) are responsible for reporting on SDG 15. Project Outcomes are in line and consistent with SDG 15. Assessment of ecosystems will enable the country to protect, conserve, restore and it will facilitate reporting on SDG implementation. Outcome 3.1 of NCA is consistent with SDG15 particularly in relation with promotion the sustainable use of terrestrial environment, halting biodiversity loss.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

During PPG, please:

-refine the ToC and notably align it with the revisions made in the rest of the PIF after the first review (component 2). While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

- Please further define the practical or policy decision(s) the project will work on in component 2 and how the project plans to influence it. It will involve explaining how the Upper Senqu Catchment is currently managed, and through what specific means the project is to improve its management (e.g. is there a management plan or equivalent that

would be revised with the NCAA results, will the current monitoring framework be augmented with the NCAA tools, etc.).

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- Theory of change (ToC): Please revise the root cause, threat and barrier components of the ToC diagram according to the related comment provided further up.

The ToC will have to be refined during PPG. While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient.

Please refer to STAP's guidance: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

2- Please revise component 2:

2a. to outline a precise practical or policy decision the project will work on, and building the component entirely to inform that decision, i.e. all assessment and accounts should be geared towards that decision rather than the opposite. This involves explaining the relevance of that decision, its baseline, and how the project will concretely influence it, including the relevance of NCAA for that particular decision, the timeliness of the project compared to when the decision is to take place, and how the key decision makers would be involved in the project, from shaping the NCAA analyses, getting support in the actual decision-making, to ideally, benefiting from a NCAA-based monitoring framework for the implementation of the decision.

2b. to include selection criteria and indicative information on anticipated number and scale of target sites. While target site(s) can be left to PPG to define, clear selection criteria need to be outlined at PIF stage, and an indicative idea of the scale should be provided. At a minimum, selection criteria should include the global relevance of biodiversity hosted in the site, and criteria related to the policy/practical decision the project decided to work on (e.g., relevance of the site for that decision, can the project realistically influence that decision in the target sites with regards to timing, informative power of NCAA, and existing institutional arrangements for that decision). Ideally, a tentative list of sites would be included at PIF stage.

Agency Response

<p>JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.</p> <p>During PPG, please:</p> <p>-refine the ToC and notably align it with the revisions made in the rest of the PIF after the first review (component 2). While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer</p> <p>- Please further define the precise practical or policy decision(s) the project will work on in component 2 and how the project plans to influence it. It will involve explaining how the Upper Senqu Catchment is currently managed, and through what specific means the project is to improve its management (e.g. is there a management plan or equivalent that would be revised with the NCAA results, will the current monitoring framework be augmented with the NCAA tools, etc.).</p>	<p>Agreed. The Theory of Change presented will be further refined during the PPG, expressing more clearly the causal pathways chosen to address existing barriers and by which interventions desired impact is expected to be made. This will be expressed both in the diagram/flow chart as well in the related narrative.</p> <p>During the PPG phase, additional information on the present management of the Upper Senqu Catchment will be detailed and how the project intends to improve the current management. This will most likely entail revision/updating of the present watershed management plan and related guidelines with use of NCA results, based on the water and land accounts to establish and the related analysis and will look into how the NCA results can support and improve existing monitoring set-up.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>JS 5/2/2022 ?</p> <p>1- Theory of change (ToC): Please revise the root cause, threat and barrier components of the ToC diagram according to the related comment provided further up.</p> <p>The ToC will have to be refined during PPG. While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>The ToC has been revised and is now linking the barriers analysis with the associated activities leading to outputs/intermediary impacts and eventually to the long-term impact and outcomes, and reflecting key assumptions.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>2- Please revise component 2:</p> <p>2a. to outline a precise practical or policy decision the project will work on, and building the component entirely to inform that decision, i.e. all assessment and accounts should be geared towards that decision rather than the opposite. This involves explaining the relevance of that decision, its baseline, and how the project will concretely influence it, including the relevance of NCAA for that particular decision, the timeliness of the project compared to when the decision is to take place, and how the key decision makers would be involved in the project, from shaping the NCAA analyses, getting support in the actual decision-making, to ideally, benefiting from a NCAA-based monitoring framework for the implementation of the decision.</p>	<p>Agreed. See discussion above on adjustments/revisions that have been made to Component 2, accommodating the guidance and suggestions made, including rephrasing of the Component, its outcome and respective outputs.</p>
<p>2b. to include selection criteria and indicative information on anticipated number and scale of target sites. While target site(s) can be left to PPG to define, clear selection criteria need to be outlined at PIF stage, and an indicative idea of the scale should be provided. At a minimum, selection criteria should include the global relevance of biodiversity hosted in the site, and criteria related to the policy/practical decision the project decided to work on (e.g., relevance of the site for that decision, can the project realistically influence that decision in the target sites with regards to timing, informative power of NCAA, and existing institutional arrangements for that decision). Ideally, a tentative list of sites would be included at PIF stage.</p>	<p>As discussed above, in close consultation with the stakeholders, the Upper Senqu Catchment has been identified as preferred site, based on a set of selection criteria, see page 12-13 of the PIF. In a selection set-up the Upper Senqu Catchment was compared with the Upper Mohokare Catchment and was given the priority based on the scoring for the set of selection criteria applied. As detailed in the description of the pilot area, these selection criteria were: Occurrence of protected areas or other areas with high biodiversity value, Key hydrological area, Data availability, Private sector presence/engagement, Community livelihoods, Environmental challenges and Environmental services.</p>

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -Please see comment in the first comment box on the need to for NCAA projects to respond to a specific practical/policy decision.

Agency Response [cleared on 13 June 2022](#)

<p>Please see comment in the first comment box on the need to for NCAA projects to respond to a specific practical/policy decision.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u> Agreed. See discussion above on adjustments/revisions that have been made to Component 2, accommodating the guidance and suggestions made, including rephrasing of the Component, its outcome and respective outputs. The Component now is aimed the mainstreaming of natural capital and its assessment and its application in integrated watershed management of upper Senqu.</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

[JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.](#)

JS 5/2/2022 -To be revisited for component 2 once other comments on this component are addressed.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

<p>To be revisited for component 2 once other comments on this component are addressed.</p> <p>The rest is cleared.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u> The incremental/cost reasoning has been rephrased, reflecting the revision of Component 2 and the newly formulated Outcome and Outputs.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -Please see other comment box related to core indicators.

Agency Response

JS 5/2/2022 - Please see other comment box related to core indicators.	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>With the selection of two sub-catchments, Khubelu and the Senqunyane sub-catchment within the Upper Senqu catchment, this would lead, as explained above, to a target of combined 93,521ha for Core Indicator 4, area of landscape under improved practices, and 4,658 direct beneficiaries (2,257F, 2,401M) for Core Indicator 11. These targets need to be confirmed and further detailed if possible during the PPG process.</p>
------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

During PPG, please develop a strong up-scaling/replication strategy, with remains weak at PIF stage.

JS 5/2/2022 -Sustainability and scaling-up are to be revisited for component 2 once other comments on this component are addressed.

Innovation is cleared.

Agency Response

<p>JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.</p> <p>During PPG, please develop a strong up-scaling/replication strategy, with remains weak at PIF stage.</p>	<p>Agreed. The replication section will be further reviewed and updated, looking into key factors that will enhance likelihood of replication of emerging good practices piloted by the project in other geographic areas of Lesotho.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Sustainability and scaling-up are to be revisited for component 2 once other comments on this component are addressed.</p> <p>Innovation is cleared.</p>	<p>Sustainability and scaling-up are rephrased for Component 2, taking into consideration the revised build-up of the Component and respective outputs and the opportunity they provide for enhanced lasting-impact (sustainability) and scaling-up potential.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -In the absence of selected sites at PIF stage, a map of Lesotho is provided.

1- Please provide coordinates as text in the PIF.

Agency Response

cleared on 13 June 2022

<p>In the absence of selected sites at PIF stage, a map of Lesotho is provided.</p> <p>1- Please provide coordinates as text in the PIF.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u></p> <p>A map with the outline of the Upper Senqu Catchment has been provided, together with the geographic coordinates.</p> <p>Most Central Latitude: -29.484, Longitude: 28.682</p> <p>See Annex A for the 4 corner points with geographic coordinates.</p> <p>An additional map with the location of the sub-catchments has been included in Annex A.</p>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

JS 6/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/15/2022 -

1-Please provide information on what kind of stakeholder consultations were carried out during project design, including with civil society and indigenous peoples. It is evident that the agency has carried out some kind of stakeholder analysis. In addition, it indicates that consultations with indigenous Peoples/ Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector Entities have been carried out. The submission however does not include any information on these consultations.

The rest is cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- Please add a short summary of the consultations carried out to date to inform the PIF design.

2- The stakeholder mapping is limited to ministries and the generic "local communities" category. Please refine, including as well, and as relevant, academia, NGOs, private sector, and key international partners. The Stakeholder mapping should also be responsive to the specific practical/policy question that will be decided upon.

Agency Response

<p>JS 6/15/2022 -</p> <p>1-Please provide information on what kind of stakeholder consultations were carried out during project design, including with civil society and indigenous peoples. It is evident that the agency has carried out some kind of stakeholder analysis. In addition, it indicates that consultations with indigenous Peoples/ Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector Entities have been carried out. The submission however does not include any information on these consultations.</p> <p>The rest is cleared.</p> <p>1- Please add a short summary of the consultations carried out to date to inform the PIF design.</p>	<p>As described in the PIF, various consultations were held with different groups of stakeholders. These consultations varied between initial discussions with representatives of key ministries on the definition of the precise theme and the matching needs in Lesotho to more in depth focus group discussion with groups of stakeholders at national level, followed by meetings with representatives of stakeholders present and active in the Upper Senqu Catchment.</p> <p>These last meetings included representatives of NGOs (Traditional Healers Association, Arts and Crafts Associations), private sector (Mining companies present in the Upper Senqu Catchment, fishing companies, nature-based production companies) and local communities (Herders and Grazing Associations, as important stakeholders representing local communities in 5 Districts of the Upper Senqu Catchment). The notion of indigenous peoples is not considered in Lesotho, because all people are seen as equal. Therefore, only representatives of local communities are consulted. However, we confirm that detailed and wide stakeholder consultations will be undertaken during the PPG stage.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1- Please add a short summary of the consultations carried out to date to inform the PIF design.

response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022

Consultations

Initial consultations were held in Maseru, Lesotho with representatives of the Ministry of Planning and Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture on the goals of the PIF, existing needs and challenges and potential contribution of NCA in Lesotho (March 14th 2022).

Additional consultations were held on May 14th 2022 with:

? Ministry of Development Planning-Bureau of Statistics (BOS)

? National University of Lesotho

? Ministry of Trade and Industry

? Ministry of Water (Water Affairs)

? Ministry of Small Business

? International Partners (UNDP, FAO, GIZ, Catholic Relief Services (CRS))

? Traditional Healers Association

Follow-up consultations were organised with the following stakeholders on 18th May 2022

? Arts and Crafts Associations

? Industries

? Ministry of Local Government

? Ministry of Finance

? Lesotho Tourism Development Cooperation (LDTA)

? BIOPAMA (Biodiversity and Protected Area Management)

? Industries

A latest round of consultations was held on May 30th with:

? Lesotho Revenue Authority (LRA)

? Lesotho Highlands Development Authority (LHDA)

? Fishing companies

2- The stakeholder mapping is limited to ministries and the generic "local communities" category. Please refine, including as well, and as relevant, academia, NGOs, private sector, and key international partners. The Stakeholder mapping should also be responsive to the specific practical/policy question that will be decided upon.

The stakeholder mapping (section 2 in the PIF) has been extended considerably, based on additional consultations with the stakeholders. Academia, NGOs, international partners and private sector stakeholders have been added and divided per category.

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

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

It is duly noted that the project will conduct a gender analysis in the project preparation phase "in order to incorporate a gender perspective in project interventions." In this regard, during PPG, the Agency is requested to take into account in its gender analysis how gender equality considerations could and should be reflected in the different project components, including in the project's outputs related to developing knowledge products and capacity-building/awareness-raising materials and other documents. The Agency may wish to look into the CBD's gender-related documents, including the CBD's post-2020 Gender Plan of Action and related documents on gender-responsive post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- Please clarify how the project is to close gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, and to generate socio-economic benefits or services for women, or consider untagging the project on these dimensions.

closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or Yes

generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. Yes

2- Please confirm in the PIF that a gender action plan or equivalent will be developed during PPG.

Agency Response

<p>It is duly noted that the project will conduct a gender analysis in the project preparation phase "in order to incorporate a gender perspective in project interventions." In this regard, during PPG, the Agency is requested to take into account in its gender analysis how gender equality considerations could and should be reflected in the different project components, including in the project's outputs related to developing knowledge products and capacity-building/awareness-raising materials and other documents. The Agency may wish to look into the CBD's gender-related documents, including the CBD's post-2020 Gender Plan of Action and related documents on gender-responsive post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.</p>	<p>Agreed and thank you for the additional suggestions, which will be followed during the PPG stage.</p>
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>1. Please clarify how the project is to close gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, and to generate socio-economic benefits or services for women, or consider untagging the project on these dimensions.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u> Although it is intended to support closing the gender gap in access to and control over natural resources, the impact of project for this dimension is indeed less direct. The same does apply to the potential impact on the generation of socio-economic benefits or services for women, although intended and welcome, but to be expected as a more indirect impact. These dimensions therefore have been untagged.</p>
<p>2. Please confirm in the PIF that a gender action plan or equivalent will be developed during PPG.</p>	<p>During PPG, as reflected and foreseen in the PIF description, a gender action plan will be compiled, with assistance by the Ministry of Gender, Youth and Sports and Recreation.</p>

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- Please refine the project anticipated private sector engagement following the requested revision on component 2.

Agency Response

cleared on 13 June 2022

<p>Please refine the project anticipated private sector engagement following the requested revision on component 2.</p>	<p><u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u> With the revision of Component 2 and the selection of the Upper Senqu Catchment as pilot area, a better selection of private stakeholders has been included, reflecting the presence and engagement of, amongst others, diamond mines, fishery companies, natural resource production companies etc. See the expanded stakeholder table in section 2 on page 30 of the PIF.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -

1- Please address the risk that the additional information provided through NCAA is not acted upon, does not change the business as usual.

2- Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

- a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).
- b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.
- c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).
- d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>

3- Please note that the GEF expects all new PIFs and CEO Endorsements to demonstrate a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent risks and opportunities relative to specific context for the project. Please refer to "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics"

<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>) and revise the COVID risk analysis and/or other parts of the CEO endorsement request accordingly.

4- Additional risks related to the specific practical/policy decision to be targeted in component 2 may have to be considered.

Agency Response

[cleared on 13 June 2022](#)

1- Please address the risk that the additional information provided through NCAA is not acted upon, does not change the business as usual.	response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022 Added in the risk assessment table, in Section 5, Risks, page 35.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide at least a basic climate risk screening at PIF stage. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc). b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance. c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050). d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG. (https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf) 	<p>Agreed. See the more detailed climate risk screening is now included in the risk assessment table, in Section 5, Risks, page 36.</p>
<p>3- Please note that the GEF expects all new PIFs and CEO Endorsements to demonstrate a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent ?risks? and ?opportunities? relative to specific context for the project. Please refer to "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" (https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future) and revise the COVID risk analysis and/or other parts of the CEO endorsement request accordingly.</p> <p>4- Additional risks related to the specific practical/policy decision to be targeted in component 2 may have to be considered.</p>	<p>Agreed. See the now expanded section on COVID-19 management/strategy as reflected in the risk assessment table, Section 5, page 37.</p>

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

JS 6/17/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/16/2022:

The execution arrangements detailed in this section are different from to that approved in the LoE in all sections of the PIF.

While it has been corrected in the first page of the poratl entry, the section 6 Coordination still as execution by The Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture and the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning (MinDP).

Please revise this section so that it is inline with to the executing partners shown in the LoE. The execution will then be changed as necessary during PPG, especially to give a prominent execution role to the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning, which will be key for this project. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -Please explain why BOS is not the anticipated EA, or at-least co-executing agency, for this project.

Agency Response
cleared on 13 June 2022

GEFSEC Review of 16th June 2022	Agency Response
----------------------------------------	------------------------

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 JS 6/16/2022:

The execution arrangements detailed in this section are different from that approved in the LoE in all sections of the PIF.

While it has been corrected in the first page of the proposal entry, the section 6 Coordination still as execution by The Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Culture and the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning (MinDP).

Please revise this section so that it is inline with to the executing partners shown in the LoE. The execution will then be changed as necessary during PPG, especially to give a prominent execution role to the Bureau of Statistics (BOS) of the Ministry of Development Planning, which will be key for this project. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.

Agreed and corrected. In section 6 on Coordination, the coordination set-up has been changed to be aligned with the original wordings of the LoE, with the Ministry of Water, the Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation and the Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Culture as executing partners.

An updated LoE from the OFP will be prepared during the PPG phase to reflect foreseen changes in the coordination set-up, with expected inclusion of the Ministry of Planning with its vital Bureau of Statistics.

Please explain why BOS is not the anticipated EA, or at-least co-executing agency, for this project.

response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022

The BOS is a Department of the Ministry of Development Planning and therefore considered as an important co-executing agency for this project.

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

JS 6/13/2022- Cleared.

JS 5/2/2022 -Please elaborate on the alignment with the NBSAP.

Agency Response

cleared on 13 June 2022

Please elaborate on the alignment with the NBSAP.	<u>response to the GEFSEC Review Comments of 2 May 2022</u> Agreed. A paragraph has been added to Section 7 on the alignment of the project and its intended outcomes with the NBSAP, page 39.
---------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/2/2022 - Cleared. We note the project is rated low risk overall and the attached SRIF.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

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

JS 5/2/2022 -Cleared.

Agency Response [cleared on 2nd May 2022](#)

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

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

JS 6/17/2022 - The project is recommended for clearance.

JS 6/16/2022- Not at this stage. Please address the only remaining comment (comment box related to coordination) above and resubmit.

JS 6/15/2022- Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit.

JS 5/2/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit. Please contact jsapijanskas@thegef.org for any clarification.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please see guidance for PPG embedded throughout the review sheet.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/2/2022	5/2/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/13/2022	6/15/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/15/2022	6/16/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2022	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval