



# Regeneration of Livelihoods and Landscapes (ROLL) Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10723

**Countries**

Lesotho

**Project Name**

Regeneration of Livelihoods and Landscapes (ROLL) Project

**Agencies**

IFAD

**Date received by PM**

12/10/2021

**Review completed by PM**

6/8/2022

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

## PIF

### CEO Endorsement

#### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

The name of the output 1.2.3 "250 landscape management plans developed in the deform restoration of 350,000 ha" is unclear. Please clarify aligning with alternative scenario.

**May 16, 2022:**

Thank you for the amendment. In addition, we note in the beginning of the project description in the Portal that the period of time between the "Expected Implementation Start" and the "Expected Completion Date" is different from the project duration of 72 months. Please correct as needed.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

Statement revised to 250 landscape management plans developed in support of restoration of 350,000 ha of landscape (rangelands, shrub lands, grasslands and cropland). See output 1.2.3 section B.

08 June 2022

Expected Implementation Start -01/07/2022

Expected Completion Date - 30/06/2028

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

The co-financing letter from IFAD is uploaded twice and we can't find all the other co-financing letters. Please remove the repeated co-financing letters from IFAD and upload

the missing co-financing letters. Please note that each identified co-financing needs an evidence with the name of the co-financier, including the co-financing referred as "Financing Gap".

**May 16, 2022:**

1. OFID: please the exact name of the co-financier in table C ("OFID") and in the co-financing letter ("OPEC Fund").
2. OFID: we don't find in the letter the evidence of co-financing for a grant of \$499,637 as indicated in table C. Please clarify.
3. OFID: In the description below table C, please explain how the \$14,999,787 were calculated (from a loan of \$19 million according to the co-financing letter).
4. Private sector: as mentioned in the previous review, each identified co-financing needs an evidence with the name of the co-financier. As a consequence, if no evidence can be provided at this stage, then remove this co-financing from table C.
5. Government and beneficiaries: please clarify under table C where exactly is the evidence of co-financing in the PDR (page number/paragraph where we can find the same numbers as the ones indicated in table C and explain why this document can be considered a an evidence of co-financing (formal engagement of the co-financier). Also, please note that "beneficiaries" is not a co-financier name: the agency may want to remove this line in table or merge it with the co-financing of the Recipient Country Government.

**June 13, 2022:**

Thank you for the amendents and clarification. Nevertheless, the in-kind contribution co-financing letter from the Ministry of forestry, range and soil conservation is required and miising. Please submit the letter issued and signed by the ministry (a translated version in English is also required).

**July 13, 2022:**

Thank you for providing the missing co-financing letter. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

04 May 2022

The repeated IFAD co-finance letters cannot be deleted from the portal. The correct one is the one uploaded in Table C entitled: 2021-12-10 IFAD co-financing letter ROLL-GEF.

FAO Co-finance letters have been provided.

OFID letter of Endorsement: in table C, we are counting the amount of the OFID co-financing for this project and not the full loan being provided by OFID in the letter.

Co-financing letter from Private sector cannot be provided at this stage as the partner under this group is yet to be identified.

Regarding the letter from the Government and from Beneficiaries, our understanding was that we can use the ROLL PDR as this shows the Government contribution to ROLL and that of the beneficiaries.

### **8 June 2022**

1. OPEC Fund is now written in full in Table C.
2. The OFID funds were revised now with loan amounting to USD19,000,000. The USD 499,637 is deleted.
3. OFID funds were revised now USD19,000,000 as indicated in the co-financing letter.
4. The agreements with the identified private sector companies are not yet finalized. This will be done during implementation. Therefore the section on co-finance from the Private Sector is deleted and will be included when it is finalized.
5. The line on beneficiary contribution has been added to the recipient country and reference made to the IFAD documents illustrating these amounts mainly from the Project Design Report (pages 2,15 and Annex 3 in PDR already shared with the GEF)

20 June 2022

A signed letter is attached.

### **GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

The budget uploaded and in Annex E needs more details. In particular, it should include a number of units and the cost per unit, the information on the kind of staff recruited and their purpose, the different kind of meetings (and not a lump sum of \$801,500 for Technical coordinators and \$175,000 for local consultants, not a lump sum of 979766

for all the expenses under "Trainings, Workshops, Meetings"). Please provide a budget with more details. The Agency may want to use the GEF budget template to ensure the needed information is provided (Appendix A of Annex 7 in the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle Policy - GEF/C.59/Inf.03).

**May 16, 2022:**

1. Partially: some budget items are still too vague: please provide more details for expenditure category referred as "works", "Technical Assistance/Mobilization and capacity building meetings" for a cost of \$690,746 and "International Consultancies/National Food System Specialist" for a cost of \$512,596.
2. The expenditure category referred as "works/Construction of gabions and restoration of 75 000 ha of land". The unit cost is m3. please clarify how purchasing m3 will restore 75,000 ha of land.
3. The expenditure category referred as "International Consultancies/National Food System Specialist" is unclear. First, international consultant is not consistent with hiring a national specialist. Also, will the monthly cost of a national specialist be really as high as \$7,119? Please clarify and amend as needed.
4. There is no expenditure category corresponding to procurement of goods, logistics, offices, computer, expandable... Please confirm it is the case.
5. In table 9 under the Monitoring and Evaluation section, the budget from GEF resources is \$175,000 while it is \$68,000 in the uploaded budget and in Annex E of the Portal entry. Please correct and ensure the information is consistent throughout the information provided.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for amendments and correction. Cleared

Agency Response

04 May 2022

The budget has been revised as recommended.

**8 June 2022**

1. A cost break down was done for Technical Assistance category. See respective budget lines.
2. The costs of gabions is measured on the basis per m3 based on the volume of the structures. However, the gabions are placed in strategic locations to reduce water flows and surface runoff as well as improve water infiltration capacities for the restoration of land. The land area restored is what will be measured in ha. For more clarity, reference to ha of land will be omitted. The unit of measure will be number of gullies constructed.
3. The category was changed to national consultancy and the monthly cost of a national consultancy was reduced. See budget.
4. The expenditure category has been added.
5. The figure in Table 9 was matched with the figure in the GEF budget now \$175,000. The figures have been checked for consistency throughout the document.

#### **Project Preparation Grant**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**January 27, 2022:**

The available funds have not been fully utilized. Please indicate exactly the amount that has not been spent or committed and clarify that the remainder of the funds (budgeted for studies, exchange visits and workshops which could not be held due to travel restrictions imposed due to COVID-19 protocol) will be spent during the first year of the project implementation. As formulated in 2 different sentences it is not so clear.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification. Please indicate clearly that the remaining funds will be used only on eligible expenditure items under PPG within one year after the project has been CEO Endorsed.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

**This has been clarified as follows:**

The PPG resources were instrumental in the elaboration of the PIF to the CEO Endorsement document. Consultations were made with the government of Lesotho and project partners to support the development of the CEO Endorsement document at a field mission held in Lesotho. The budget utilization is at 34%. \$ 51,099.00 has been utilized/committed and \$98,901.00 has not been spent. This remainder of the funds is budgeted for studies, exchange visits and workshops which could not be held due to travel restrictions imposed due to COVID-19 protocol. The workshops and social impact analysis will be done during the first year of implementation. A summary of the PPG funds utilized and funds available is presented in the table below. See changes Annex C.

### **8 June 2022**

Noted incorporated as suggested on Annex C to confirm the funds will be used on eligible expenditure within the first year following CEO Endorsement.

### **Core indicators**

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

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**January 27, 2022:**

We don't find the methodology and calculation used to estimate the target of the core indicator 6.1 (GHG emission mitigation). Please upload the relevant supporting document. Ideally it should be the Ex-ACT tool as it is with this tool that the project proponents plan to monitor this core indicator according to the project document.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for uploading the document supporting the calculations. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

04 May 2022

The Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool EX-ACT and Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model GLEAM-i were used to estimate the mitigation potential.

The EX-ACT and GLEAM-i tool including the calculations are attached in Annex J.



## **Part II ? Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

1. The baseline is only focused on the ROLL project and some other projects supported by the international cooperation. Please elaborate further on 1- the institutional framework at national and local level including the landscape governance system, and on the exiting national initiatives and plans that are relevant to the project; and 2- the targeted beneficiaries and how they are organized (community-based and private organizations...).

2. The difference between the ROLL and the ROLL-GEF is not clear. While the ROLL project has already been designed and will start in Quarter 1 2022, we learn in the incremental reasoning that the contribution of the GEF will ensure "the establishment of the regeneration fund". The number of beneficiaries is also different for the ROLL and for the ROLL-GEF. Are these 2 projects targeting different landscapes? In this section, please elaborate further on the concrete investments the ROLL project will support, its total envelop, its Facility and its organization (PMU) without GEF support so that we can better understand the difference from and added value of the GEF.

**May 17, 2022:**

1. Thank you for the additional information. Nevertheless, in addition to ROLL, there is no indication of relevant national initiatives, plans or policies the project will benefit from and/or articulate with. Please clarify this point. In addition, the text under "Project Implementation Arrangements" is not relevant here and should be moved or merged to the section "6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination". Please amend accordingly. In the baseline scenario, please describe the PMU, institutional arrangements and overall governance structures of the ROLL only (without the GEF contribution).

2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
3. We don't find any "figure 4-1 below". Please clarify.
4. Please clarify in the Portal entry what "LS-ROLL" stands for.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared

Agency Response

04 May 2022

1.1. The institutional framework at national and local level including the landscape governance system has been included just below the ROLL project baseline outline.

1.2. The targeted beneficiaries. The targeted beneficiaries and how they are organised has been further elaborated on in the baseline scenario Section, page 17 of the CEO endorsement.

2. The difference between the ROLL and the ROLL

+GEF has been elaborated in the baseline scenario Section, page 18. The GEF financing will target a subset of the landscapes that are targeted by the baseline ROLL project. The GEF finance targeted landscapes are those that are considered high priority for the environmental benefits with criteria determined jointly with Department of Environment and the MFRCS.

**8 June 2022**

1. The section on "Implementation arrangement" has been moved to section 6- "Institutional arrangements and coordination"

Relevant national initiatives, plans or policies are included in section 7. *Consistency with National Priorities.*

The PMU will be responsible for day to day management and coordination of ROLL, including ROLL's financial matters. The PMU will be housed at the Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC) and collaborate closely with other key Ministries. A Steering Committee, composed of relevant national actors will provide strategic oversight and a Technical Advisory Committee (inter-ministerial body), will support project implementation progress and technical aspects

3. Corrected, now Figure 1

4. LS-ROLL is the baseline project referring to Lesotho ROLL. This has been changed to ROLL for consistency.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**January 27, 2022:**

1. Please clarify what is reference of the so-called "the innovative graduation model" and where is the "Section 3 of ROLL's PIM" the text is referring to (there is no such section in the Portal entry).

2. Some outcomes and outputs are written differently in table B and in the alternative scenario. Some differences can be relatively important for the meaning such as the missing "as trainers" in the output 1.1.3 of table B. Please make sure they are the same throughout all the project description.

3. In component 1, please clarify what the "LDN Hubs" are. They are only mentioned in table B and in the alternative scenario.

4. The establishment of the regeneration coalitions is a key milestone of the project to implement the activities on the ground. Under the outcome 1.2.1 please elaborate further on the activities that will be undertaken to establish the coalitions and what will concretely form these coalitions (recognized status, kind of agreement, formal link with the project governance and/or national institutions...).

5. In the title of the outcome 1.2 and in other parts of the project description, we find the mention of "ROLL+GEF" but there is no definition. Please clarify what "ROLL+GEF" means exactly.

6. Under the outcome 2.2, there is no mention of the Facility in the outputs. Also, the concrete activities supported by the project to establish the Landscape Regeneration

Fund are not described. Please clarify in the relevant outputs where the Facility is considered and explain what are the concrete activities planned to establish the Facility and the Fund.

7. In the description, it is mentioned that the component 3 will also support the management of the project, including financial management, accounting and procurement. Please note that as per GEF policy, these expenses must be covered by the PMC and can't be covered by any of the project components. Please amend accordingly and provide a budget showing this requirement of the policy is properly considered.

8. Please clarify what is the "ROLL+ROLL" project under the outcome 3.2.

**May 17, 2022:**

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Thank you for the clarifications and amendments. Cleared.

6. Thank you for the information provided. Please clarify what "ROF" stands for the first time it appears in the project description (under component 2).

7. The title of the outcome 3.1 is missing under component 3. Please complete.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

04 May 2022

1. The ROLL PIM is attached. Please refer to section 3 of the ROL'S PIM for further elaboration of the innovative graduation model.

2. Information on Table B is now the same as that in the "the alternative scenario" section.

3. The LND Hubs have been clarified under Outcome 1.2 as:

?LDN Hubs - land degradation neutrality information hubs are centres established as a mechanism for sharing and verification of monitoring data, including the dissemination of lessons learned and best practices to primary and secondary stakeholders in a bid to meeting Lesotho's Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets set to be met by 2030.?

4. Landscape regeneration coalitions have been clarified under outcome 1.2 as:

The activities that will be undertaken to establish landscape regeneration coalitions include:

- ? Identification of the potential landscapes to be regenerated,
- ? Identification of the stakeholders in the said landscapes,
- ? Sensitization of all the stakeholders within the said landscape about the sub-project requirements,
- ? Establishment of representative committees to spearhead the activities,
- ? Holding of community meeting to identify and prioritise the actual activities to be undertaken within this landscape.
- ? Request for funding from the project after all the screening processes.

The landscape regeneration coalitions will be comprised of chiefs, local government councillors, government officials, local resource management groups, and community members.

The Coalition Committees will be the link of the sub-projects with the main project and the approved sub-project proposals will form part of the sub-project agreement.

5. 'ROLL+GEF' has been defined in Footnote 9 as : 'ROLL+GEF in this document refers to the primary baseline project, Lesotho Regeneration of Landscapes and Livelihoods (ROLL) project, which was designed by IFAD and GoL, plus additional investment with GEF resources?

6. The setting up of the Facility has been included as outcome 2.2.1 both in table B and the 'alternative Scenarios' section. The Facility has been elaborated as: 'a mechanism to enable coalition building and provide incentives to smallholder farmers and pastoralists to adopt an integrated approach to managing the productive landscape?

The establishment of the ROF will be in three phases i) Design phase year 1, ii) Regeneration opportunities fund Phase 1 (Y2-Y6); iii)Regeneration Opportunities Fund Phase 2 (Post-project). The main activities will include:

- Phase 1:** i) Design of the fund structure and development of the Investment manual; ii) Establishment of the Project Steering Committee (PSC); iii) Approval of the Fund by ROLL PSC and IFAD.

- Phase 2:** i) The focus will be on making investments following the Investment Manual and Investment Committee; ii) An investment committee is established comprising of PSC and investors representatives; iii) An evaluation of the impact and efficiency of Fund under different activities.

- Phase 3:** i) The Fund will continue to operate based on identified successful activities and investment strategies; ii) Governance of the Fund may evolve, reflecting the composition of Investors. iii) A detailed description of the Fund is also provided in section 7 of ROLL PIM.

- 

- 7. The section has been deleted to align with the GEF policy. The budget for Component 3 covers M &E budget that pertains to the costs related to Environment and Social Impact Assessment for additional GEF intervention areas

8. The reference to ROLL+ROLL was an error. The error was rectified by adding ROLL +GEF. 'ROLL+GEF' has been defined in Footnote 9 as :

'ROLL+GEF in this document refers to the primary baseline project, Lesotho Regeneration of Landscapes and Livelihoods (ROLL) project, which was designed by IFAD and GoL, plus additional investment with GEF resources?

Outcome 3.2

•8 June 2022

•

6. ROF, the Regeneration Opportunities Fund, has been explained in full under Component 2. Where it first appears. Full explanation on section 4 is deleted.

7. Outcome 3.1 was added to component 3 (*Improved monitoring tools and procedures to generate LDN data, which enable measurement of environmental and socio-economic change.*)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

There is no further elaboration from the PIF. The first paragraph in particular is the one related to the GEF LD Focal Area and remains very general. Please elaborate further in this paragraph on how concretely the proposed activities are aligned with LD 1-1 and LD 1-4, including what precise activities and results on the ground contribute to the achievement of both LD 1-1 and LD 1-4 objectives.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

The proposed ROLL+GEF project is designed to particularly contribute to the goals of the land degradation focal area to *maintain or improving agro-ecosystem services and sustain rural livelihoods through integrated watershed and sustainable land management (LD 1-1)*. In alignment with LD 1-1 the project will bring together local, regional and national stakeholders to jointly plan for and implement SLM measures, to reduce competing land uses and increasing the resilience in landscapes and their users. Specifically activities such as agroforestry, rangeland management, forest land restoration and landscape management which including gully reclamation, and conservation agriculture will be implemented. The project will also contribute to *reducing pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape (LD 1-4)*. The LD 1-4 activities will be achieved by pooling resources for SLM and thus establishing a coordinated scheme for programming and financing integrated sustainable land management in the targeted landscapes and beyond. Precisely the proposed activities under LD-1-4 include labour-based schemes and development of physical infrastructures aimed at reducing pressure in catchments and (ii) support for off-farm income-generating activities such as beekeeping, dried

indigenous herbs and medicinal plants, artisanal products; and payment for ecosystem services.

(Section 4) of the CE endorsement document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

No, the text in this section is nearly exactly the same as at PIF stage. For each global benefit, please elaborate further adding information on the type of lands and practices, the type of restoration, and for the indicator 6.1 in particular, how and on what kind of lands the mitigation will be achieved.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

Additional information has been included see information in track changes section 6.

In addition the project will contribute to the elaboration of best practices and lessons to the global knowledge platforms to strengthen global knowledge exchange and land restoration.

? Area of land restored: 350,000 ha (ROLL+GEF) in the selected five districts contributing 58% to 650 000 ha LDN national target. The area restored encompasses 335,000 ha rangelands, shrub lands, grasslands and 14,500 ha crop land



and reforested land (with climate resilient practices). The restoration activities will include ? reforestation, promotion of climate resilient practices, improved agronomic practices, restocking and stoking exercise, reclamation of gullies

? Area of landscape under improved management practices: 14,500 ha (7 500 ha of restored forest and shrub land, 7 000 ha of restored agricultural land) in five districts of Lesotho. The improved management practices includes improved agronomic practices, conservation agriculture.

? Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated: -9 901 543 tCO<sub>2</sub>e covering a 20 year period. The estimates of the mitigation potential is calculated using the Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool EX-ACT and Global Livestock Environmental Assessment Model GLEAM-i) on grasslands, shrub lands, cropland and rangelands. The estimations of the emissions considers the sequestration, reduction and or avoidance that result from the implementation of the activities elaborated in section B. Further elaboration of the methodology is provided in Annex J.

In addition the project will contribute to the elaboration of best practices and lessons to the UNCCD global knowledge platform managed by WOCAT to strengthen global knowledge exchange and land restoration.

Through these GEB, achieved through land restoration activities in agricultural lands, rangelands grasslands and shrub lands the project will further provide a substantial contribution to achieving Lesotho?s SLM and LDN targets, set to be by 2030. See changes section 6 of the CEO

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project Map and Coordinates**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Please also add the geographical coordinates as they are in the Prodoc.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

The exact geographical areas for the proposed sub catchments are included in Table 3. In addition, the map has been modified to include coordinates (Annex D).

**Child Project**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Partially.

1. In addition please clarify what stakeholders have been consulted during PPG for the project design (considering that all the stakeholders checked with a "yes" at the beginning of this section should have been consulted).

2. Also, please complete the second part of this section under "In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and

timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement". This part is currently empty.

**May 17, 2022:**

1. The presentation of the stakeholders consulted remains very vague: "GoL agencies", "local resource users and stakeholders"... please be more specific in the Portal entry. The text should clearly identify Civil Society Organizations, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, and Private Sector Entities. The Portal entry is the main document for the GEF and all the necessary information, even summarized should be there.

2. Thank you for the additional information. Please move it under the title "In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement". This is where the additional information should be.

**June 13, 2022:**

It is well noted that the project includes information on stakeholder engagement during project development. The project has uploaded an overview of the stakeholder engagement plan. This attachment is only titled "annex m" and was not referenced in the portal section so it is very difficult to find. In addition, it is expected at CEO endorsement stage that projects should provide a more substantive stakeholder engagement plan in line with GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement that states that "Agencies present Stakeholder Engagement Plans or equivalent documentation, with information regarding Stakeholders who have been and will be engaged, means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities in ensuring effective Stakeholder Engagement, resource requirements, and timing of engagement throughout the project/program cycle." Please label clearly the annex M so that we can find it easily and include in this annex all the details related to the project's stakeholder engagement plan as expected in GEF policy, so that we can find all the necessary information in one place (rather than being scattered between the Portal, the annex I, the annex M...).

**July 13, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response  
04 May 2022

1. The stakeholder engagement plan is included in

Annexes. The list of the stakeholders consulted is included see Annex I.

2. A section has been added on stakeholder consultation

### **8 June 2022**

Clarification on the stakeholders consulted has been provided in the portal entry. The GoL Agencies have been listed and Local Resource users that are the communities and their organisations (e.g. Community Conservation Forum).

2.This section has been moved as proposed.

### **20 June 2022**

A comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan is provided in Annex I.

Stakeholders who have been consulted, means of engagement, dissemination of information, roles and responsibilities ensuring

effective Stakeholder Engagement, resource requirements, and timing and frequency of engagement throughout the project has been added in Table 5.5 in the Stakeholder engagement plan.

Information in Annex M which provides a list of people met is added to Annex I Therefore Annex M can be considered deleted, as we cannot delete it from the portal we requested the portal helpdesk assistance and it is now deleted.

### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

One important element identified for women empowerment is the supply of labour/time water and energy saving as well as climate-smart technologies. Considering the allocated budget for this element is relatively limited (\$80,000) and the number of beneficiaries (10,000 women), please clarify what this activity concretely includes and how the result will be achieved.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

## Agency Response

04 May 2022

The activity includes the supply of labour/energy saving stoves and climate smart technologies. The budget includes procurement and supply of technologies/devices to the beneficiaries and training on the use of the provided technologies. The baseline study will include a specific section on gender. This will facilitate better inclusion of women in the ROLL while also taking all possible issues and needs that needs to be addressed to ensure that not only women challenges but the entire gender sensitivity of the project. See changes on ROLL+GEF Gender Action Plan (GAP) Table 7.

### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

1. Please clarify what the "ROF" is. In the Portal entry, it appears for the first time in this section on private sector engagement and then in the Project Results Framework. We understand it is likely the Regeneration Fund but it is not said and the acronym doesn't correspond.
2. The availability of the ROLL is at the core of the project strategy to meet its objectives. While it is articulated with the private sector, this facility is not mentioned in this section. Please elaborate on how the private sector will engage in the project through the ROLL.
3. The description is general and doesn't mention particular entities from the private sector. Nevertheless, some private sector entities are well identified and will participate in the PSC. Please be more specific about the engagement of of the private sector in the project when it is already known (providing the name of the entities and how they will engage).

**May 17, 2022:**

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

## Agency Response

04 May 2022

1. Regeneration Opportunities Fund (ROF) has be defined in footnote 19
2. The ROLL project aims to engage the private sector in all stages of the project from design, resource mobilisation and project implementation. Specifically the ROF will, collaborate with other partners active in the private sector development and finance space, including rural financial institutions for resource mobilisation and development of the Facility. The private sector will also be part of the PSC and will be instrumental in offering technical assistance. (Changes included on section 4. Private Sector Engagement.
3. The main private sector actors among others who will be involved in project activities includes Sasol, Pegasys Strategy and Development (Pty) Ltd consulting company, Impact investment funds who will be involved in the development of the ROF. Trans Caledonon Tunnel Authority will pay a role on investment in the ROF on water availability for South Africa. Africa clean energy will support the provision of efficient alternate energy sources that will reduce wood consumption and the greenhouse emissions. Changes inserted on section 4 Private sector last paragraph.

#### **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

The text "The project will therefore build practical skills... to better respond to the negative impacts of climate change" at the end of the section is a repetition of what is already written in the table. Please remove this text.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

The text has been removed

**Coordination**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

The description focuses on the partners and executing functions. Please also clarify the role of IFAD in the project as GEF Agency.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

The role of IFAD has been clarified as:

IFAD as the GEF Agency will have the strategic oversight of the project and will conduct supervision missions and engage with the implementing Ministry through the PS Forestry. It will also have operational oversight of the project and engage with the Project Management Unit (PMU) and provide operational and technical support, conduct bi-annual implementation support missions and review Bi-annual progress reports from the PMU.

**Consistency with National Priorities**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

1. There is no Annex H in the Portal entry and we didn't find it in the documents uploaded (there are annexes with numbers and Appendices with letters... with no table of content of very long documents... this is very confusing ). Please clarify where the detailed KM Plan is and summarize the KM approach in the Portal entry making sure the following information is also clearly included in this section: 1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan and 2) a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability.
2. The LDN information hubs are not mentioned while they are one of the key KM outcomes of the project. Please consider including them in the Knowledge Management Approach.
3. In addition to the description of the KM approach, please provide a budget including the key deliverables and a timeline.

**May 17, 2022:**

1. We don't find the Annex G and we don't know in which document we need to find page 96. This is still very confusing. Please include all the annexes relevant for this GEF project in one single document with a clear table of content at the beginning.
- 1 bis. Please clarify how the following comment has been addressed in the Portal entry: "Please clarify where the detailed KM Plan is and summarize the KM approach in the Portal entry making sure the following information is also clearly included in this section: 1) how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan and 2) a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability".
2. No, we don't find any mention of the LDN hubs in the Knowledge Management section of the Portal entry. Please address this comment.
3. No, the budget (of GEF resources) including the key deliverables and a timeline is still missing in this section. Please complete as needed.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared



## Agency Response

04 May 2022

1. Annex H is on page 96, the "Preliminary Knowledge Management Action Plan" Now on Annex G
2. Reference to the LDN hubs has been included in the Knowledge management approach. Changes inserted in Annex G.
3. The estimated budget for KM activities is USD 2 379 880. The key deliverables and the timeframe are indicated in the Preliminary Knowledge Management Action Plan in Annex G which will be refined at start up with stakeholders basing on a better understanding of the key information needs for the project to be successful.

## 8 June 2022

A separate document has been included with annexes and an introductory list of the Annexes.

The reference to the LDN Hubs has been included in the KM section.

A summary of the KM budget has been included in the section.

## Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

### Monitoring and Evaluation

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

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

We note that the M&E costs are nearly all covered by the co-financing and the GEF is expected to contribute to it covering the cost of the "Environment and Social Impact Assessment for additional GEF intervention areas". This activity is not described under the alternative scenario and doesn't seem to be related to any of the expected project M&E activities. Please clarify what this activity is under the alternative scenario and consider removing it from the M&E plan unless well justified.

**May 17, 2022:**

1. Please provide the details of the breakdown of the different activities supported by the GEF in the budgeted M&E plan. In table 9, there is only 1 line with the total amount.

2. According to table 9, the "Inception Report (M&E part)", "Supervision missions" and "Monitoring site visits" are presented to be free (no cost charged to the GEF neither to the co-financing). Is that realistic? Please explain.

3. According to the budget, the M&E plan still includes the item "Environment and Social Impact Assessment for additional GEF intervention areas". Please clarify what this activity is under the alternative scenario and consider removing it from the M&E plan unless well justified.

4. The outcome 3.1 is supported by a GEF financing of \$175,000 in table B and \$107,000 in the uploaded budget. This is not consistent. Please correct as needed.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.

## Agency Response

04 May 2022

The US\$ 175 was further broken down to include some monitoring and evaluation tools and assessments that enable tracking of local and global environmental benefits. Further breakdown of the M&E activities costs re included in the ROLL+GEF budget.

**8 June 2022**

1. Detailed budget is provided in GEF budget attached.
2. The inception report and supervision missions and the monitoring site visits are included under the GEF budget.

3. This has been removed from the M&E budget includes Monitoring and evaluation tools and assessments that enable tracking of local and global environmental benefits. Reference to "Environment and

Social Impact Assessment for additional GEF intervention areas" has been clarified to refer to the biodiversity conservation prioritised areas within the landscapes that would require these studies to contribute to establishing a baseline and inform investments.

4. This has been amended so that section B is consistent GEF budget

#### **Benefits**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Only the first paragraph with 4 lines described the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project. This is too limited. Please elaborate further presenting with details the socioeconomic benefits at local and national level for the different types of beneficiaries involved, including women and youth.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

The project will support the promotion of alternative energy sources, saving labour/time, water and energy. The alternate energy sources will reduce firewood use, which contributes to soil erosion and general land degradation. The clean and efficient energy sources will reduce women's time to collect firewood. Time and labour saving climate-

smart technologies could help improve the livelihoods of women. The project aims to generate more income and agricultural produce while at the same time reducing the labour burden on women and youth to improve their livelihoods.

The project will build the capacity of 250 stakeholders and communities in 5 districts on land degradation, knowledge enhancement on root causes for landscape degradation, and landscape management. The capacity building will empower at least 50% of women and youth to enhance the SLM and climate-resilient technologies leading to improved crop and livestock production. The envisaged collaborative planning with communities through building coalitions can strengthen social and economic development.

Collaborative planning leads to developing a shared community vision, which supports social capital. Changes indicated on section 10 paragraph 2 and 3.

#### **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Partially. Please address below some comments to specific annexes.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

1. When mentioning the GEF core indicators in the table, please be more explicit using the full name to the core indicator such as, for instance, "GEF core Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems".
2. In the Project Results Framework, the outcomes and outputs and their numbering are different from table B and the alternative scenario. Please amend the table and make sure the information is consistent throughout all the project description.
3. The Project Results Framework doesn't mention the establishment of the Landscape Regeneration Fund (but "Facility and Fund") while this Fund is key for the project success and scaling potential. Please clarify adding an explicit mention of this fund in the Project Results Framework.

**May 17, 2022:**

1. Partially. We don't find GEF CI6.1 "Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector". Please complete.

2 and 3. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

1. The GEF core Indicators are mentioned in full in the Project Results Framework table.

2. The Project Results Framework has been reviewed to correct the numbering and content of the table.

3. The Landscape Regeneration Fund has been mentioned in the Project Results Framework, **Output 2.2.2:**

**8 June 2022**

1. This is provided in CI6.1 under the core indicators

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

No, the responses to comments from Council (from Germany) are missing. Please address these comments by 1- providing the responses in the Annex B; 2- making sure they are addressed in the project document and 3; indicating where in the project description they are actually taken into account.

**May 17, 2022:**

The responses are unclear: While Agency responses in the review sheet refers to page 26, the table B refers to page 22. In the project description we find for instance mention of governance and management of natural resources in page 24. For each response, please check the page number and for each comment, please copy in the table the exact text which address it in the project description.

**June 8, 2022:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

04 May 2022

IFAD notes with thanks Germany's suggestion to revise the cost associated with component

1. The Germany Comments have been included in Annex B as section B.1
2. The governance and management of natural resources has been included in the 'Project Description section' on page 26 and in the Risk section on page FF. and have been highlighted in yellow.
3. Enhancement of the enabling environment has been included in the 'Project Description section' on page 26.

**8 June 2022**

The response is indicated on page 22 as follows.

This component will be premised on the formation and operation of successful coalitions of local, district and national partners. These coalitions will basically be community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) groups and will be involved in the management of resources such as land, forests, wildlife and water by collective, local institutions for local benefit. These local and collective natural resource governance arrangements and management practices are being promoted by a wide range of policy makers and development and conservation practitioners in response to various economic, social, environmental and political pressures.

CBNRM equally applies to traditional resource management arrangements, such as the collective regimes governing rangelands and pastoralist grazing reserves, in-shore fisheries, or communally managed forests. These approaches eliminate centralized control and exploitation of resources and allows the resources to be governed, managed and controlled at local level. This further entails community capacity building in governance and management of natural resources in Lesotho.

In addition. Response also included in Table 8 page 46 as follows - Successful local and collective coalitions of local, district and national partners will be formed and capacitated in natural resource governance arrangements and management practices.

#### **STAP comments**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

**January 27, 2022:**

No, the responses to STAP comments are missing. Please address these comments by 1- providing the responses in the Annex B; 2- making sure they are addressed in the project document and 3; indicating where in the project description they are actually taken into account.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

04 May 2022

The STAP comments and responses have been included in the Annex B. B.2. The comments were addressed during the design of the project with a further elaboration of the criteria for the prioritisation of the different landscapes and also the graduation model.

#### **Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

Cleared if the comment above on PPG is addressed.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 27, 2022:**

Please also add the geographical coordinates as they are in the Prodoc.

**May 17, 2022:**

Thank you for addressing the comment. Cleared.

Agency Response  
04 May 2022

The map with geographical coordinates has been provided. Annex D

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



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 27, 2022:**

Not yet. Please address the comments raised in this review. In addition, please consider the following:

- In the uploaded documents "IFAD-Lesotho-PDR-2000002340" and "IFAD PDR Annexes" please add a table of contents. Without such table, in a document of +300 pages, it is very difficult to find the information we are looking for to answer some specific questions. Also, those 2 documents include extensive repeated information. Please remove the unnecessary information.

- To facilitate the review: in addressing the comments, please highlight in yellow the modified text and indicate where the changes are in the responses in the review sheet.

**May 17, 2022:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments. Some annexes and acronyms seem to be coming from another document such as a Prodoc but we don't find such document uploaded in the Portal (unless it is the PIM). As a result, it is sometimes difficult to find the information the Portal entry is referring to. Please clarify in the project description the document(s) targeted by the references (for each reference such as page number, annexes and acronyms) and upload any missing document.

In addition, VERY IMPORTANT: as the cancellation date of 11 June is now very soon for this project, we advise the Agency to request an extension invoking force majeure with an eligible justification and clear new deadline for the actual CEO endorsement. Please refer to the GEF guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2020 update) - GEF/C.59/inf.03, Annex 9, for further information.

**June 13, 2022:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments above. In addition further checking of the alignment with GEF policy revealed the need to address the following comments:

1. On Gender: It is duly noted that the project specifies that "The planned gender mainstreaming and targeting strategies will be refined and incorporated into the implementation manuals to ensure a gender-sensitive project implementation." Agency is requested to reflect gender perspectives also in Component 1 (Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 should be gender-sensitive/gender-responsive) and Component 3 (Outputs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2) at the project development phase. Please complete the project accordingly and indicate how this comment has been addressed in the Gender section of the review sheet.

2. On the budget table:

a. "Establish and equip PMU office" should be charged to PMC, not to a project component. Please amend accordingly.

Expenditure Category	Detailed description	Units	Qty (GEF Only)	Unit Cost (Inc. Contingencies)	Component (US\$Eq.)								Sub-Total	M&E	
					Component A			Component B			Component	Component			
					Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 1.3	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 4.1			
Technical Assistance	Support and Monitoring	lumpsum	42	5,832	244,941									244,941	
	<b>Specialist support and change management</b>														
Local Consultancies	National Food System Specialist	per month	72	3,968		285,680								285,680	
Local Consultancies	Provincial Food System facilitators	per month	144	2,490		358,512								358,512	
Local Consultancies	Operations Associate	per month	72	1,523		109,648								109,648	
Goods	Establish and equip PMU office	Lumpsum	1	18,300		18,300								18,300	
Goods	Acquisition, distribution and planting of agroforestry seedlings (fruit trees, fodder trees, forage etc.)	Hectares	13,981	2.10		29,360								29,360	

b. Support and Monitoring seems to be M&E activities ? if so, it must be charged to M&E and the section "9. Monitoring and Evaluation" needs to be amended accordingly

(in particular Table 9: Budgeted M&E Plan). If it is not the case, please clarify this budget item under the "Detailed description" column of the budget table so that it is clear this item doesn't include M&E activities.

Expenditure Category	Detailed description	Units	Qty (GEF Only)	Unit Cost (Inc. Contingencies)	Component (US\$eq.)								Sub-Total	M&E	PM C	Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) <sup>80</sup>
					Component A			Component B			Component 3	Component 4					
					Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 1.3	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.3	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 4.1					
Technical Assistance	Support and Monitoring	lump sum	42	5 832	2 44 9 41								244 941			244 941	MFRS C

c. There is a component 4 and only one outcome under component 3 in the budget table, while in the project description, there is no component 4 and 2 outcomes under component 3. Please adjust the project table so that it is consistent with the project description.

**July 13, 2022:**

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/28/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/17/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/13/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/13/2022</b>

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**