

Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Large-Scale Impact in the Grazing Lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape provinces in South Africa

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

Basic project information

GEF ID

10179

Countries

South Africa

Project Name

Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) for Large-Scale Impact in the Grazing Lands of Limpopo and Northern Cape provinces in South Africa

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

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

June 1st, 2021

Not fully addressed.

- We understand you want to keep the project as a LD1.1 and you do not consider the LD2.7. There is probably a mistake in the response (see below "the project will be kept as LD2.7").

-Please confirm and make coherent the use of acronyms: In the portal -cf. Part I on the Project Information - the main executing partner is DEA in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries in South Africa. In the review, you use DFFE; In the project document, you write: "The Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE) is the execution partner on behalf of the Government of South Africa and will work closely with the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD). Please, correct and make the information

coherent. It seems that DFFE should be the main executing partner, in association with DALRRD. Please, correct the part I in the portal.

January 31, 2021

The project content is aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements presented in the PIF under the LD 1.1 objective on agriculture.

Some project aspects deal with the LD2.7 project on LDN. It is up to the GEF Agency to decide if the use of the LD2.7 is pertinent or not. We can agree on a full focus on LD1.1. Please, confirm.

- We note that in addition to the information in the portal, there is a template of request for CEO endorsement and a project document. We invite the GEF Agency to well check the numbers ? especially in the request for CEO endorsement ? some numbers (sums) are missing or are wrong (Table B, cofinancing).

- DEA in the portal, DEFF in the project document: please use the current valid acronym: DEFF.

Agency Response

? The project will be kept as LD2.7

? The information has been added and numbers have been checked in the CEO endorsement request,

Acronyms have been corrected.

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

June 1st 2021

Not addressed.

- We are very sorry, but it is very difficult to check the changes only with the responses in the review meaning "this has been clarified", "this has been explained". Please, highlight the sections that have been added or modified in the project document and the

portal. Please ensure that the information is coherent between the project document and the portal: it seems that some corrections were made in the project document, but not reflected in the portal. Check the questions below from January 31, 2021.

- Please, note that pmc are expected to be cofinanced at a height similar to the project cofinancing ratio, or 1:8. With pmc of \$192,848, we would expect around \$1.54 million.

- Please note that the pmc should be calculated based on the grant used for the project components (=\$3,439,968). \$192,848 represents 5.61% of this amount. You were then right to maintain the rationale provided in the portal under the table B: "**The PMC for this project is higher than the norm for the following reasons. The project is being implemented in two sites that are at least 800 miles apart, creating a need for an expanded PMU team that can sufficiently monitor implementation in both sites.**" We can accept this reasoning.

- However, the second part of the explanation is not an element to justify additional costs. We suggest removing this information from the portal below the table B: **Further to the exchanges held between the agency and the Government on implementing arrangements, UNEP was selected by the Government to play the role of executing agency for this project (costs included in the components). This has resulted in higher costs for project management.**

January 31, 2021

Result framework

Component 1 and 4

- All outputs under the component 1 are potentially welcome if you can make the case about the current commitment from national, provincial, and local levels in view of sustainability. Please, clarify. This comment is also applicable to the component 4 on learning and policy dialogue.

- The role of cofinancing in these components 1 and 4 would also help to better understand the additionality of GEF resources. Please, clarify.

Component 2

- Output 2.1.2: LDN targets and investment priorities are validated: Except a mistake of our part, we have not seen any map related to the existing LDN targets and priorities. Could you better explain how the proposed work fits with the state of the LDN framework in South Africa?

Component 3

- Please, explain how you can reach such high targets with only the component 3 in investment for \$1.1 million of GEF resources and a total cofinancing of \$2.45 million.

- Output 3.1.3 and 3.1.4: Could you please confirm cofinancing from the targeted private sector entities and financing mechanisms.?

Project Management Costs

- We are ready to understand the need for higher pmc than usual because of the logistics of the project targeting landscapes in Limpopo and Northern Cap Provinces distant from 800 miles (6%). Please, detail the budget lines that need additional resources.
- The additional fee of \$417,876 (13%) for UNEP as additional intermediary is just not aligned with GEF policies. These expenses should be supported by existing budget lines, between the Agency fees and eventually pmc. See the recommendations in the item 14 (Coordination).
- Cofinancing would also be needed for any role of a third entity in project arrangements . If this solution is still explored, please, correct.

Agency Response

- ? Component 1 & 4: This has been clarified as well as co-financing amounts
- ? Component 2: National LDN targets have been unpacked and explained in Component 2 (page 99).
- ? Component 3: GEF funding has been increased by \$100 000 and co-financing has been increased to \$9.9 million. Total co-financing has been increased to \$27,5 million
- ? Output 3.1.3 and 3.1.4. Co-financing from the private sector has not been sourced. However, once the project begins, service providers will be selected through a competitive bid process which should provide more clarity on the financing mechanisms and should provide co-financing.
- ? The PMC cost has been reduced to 5%. Additional resources will be made available through co-financing from Government Agencies.

The additional fee for UNEP has been dropped. DFFE/DALRRD will be responsible for lead execution, while UNEP will be a co-executor. UNEP has provided \$1 000 000 in co-financing.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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

June 2, 2021

The letter of cofinancing from DEFF mentions "R60 000 000.00 (approximately US\$4 094 480.89)". However, you included in the table C an amount of \$17,729,417. Please, clarify.

January 31, 2021

- In the portal, the current level of cofinancing is just not acceptable (\$2.45 million, ratio under 1:1), very far from the expectations at PIF level (\$145 million, ratio: 1: 40). Some explanations would be welcome to understand the situation. Please, note that a cofinancing of \$31.6 million is mentioned in the project document. Please check the different documents (portal, project document, and request for CEO endorsement) and make information coherent. See also the other numbers. There are different numbers in the table B, C, and D.

- The explanation provided "cofinancing not mobilized" is not enough. A cofinancing ratio under 1:1 is a very wrong signal about the additionality of the GEF resources. The project seems a stand-alone project with out any catalytic effect for scaling up.

- It is not the intent to finance a GEF LD stand-alone project, especially in a country as South Africa, pretty advanced in the field of NRM. Please, revise the reasoning to highlight the additionality of the GEF resources.

- At PIF level, Germany mentioned potential synergies with two projects with the Ministry of Agriculture. Did you explore these opportunities?

- The PIF also builds on several initiatives (WOCAT, Landcare, Working for Water, Environmental Protection and Infrastructure Programme, etc): Did you approach these partners for potential cofinancing?

- LDN is also about innovation and the commitment of the private sector and investments partners: Did you explore any opportunities in these directions?

Agency Response

? Co-financing of \$27,5 million has been assured. The numbers between ProDoc and the CEO Endorsement has been cross checked.

? PIF co-financing was given as \$31,6 million.

? Additionality and scaling up have been expanded in Section 4.3 (page 89).

? DFFE stated categorically that collaboration with GIZ was not an option,

? These organisations were approached. Co-financing has now been sourced from LAndCare, Working on Land, SANBI and UNEP,

Once the project begins, private sector service providers will be selected through a competitive bid process which should provide more clarity on the financing mechanisms and should provide co-financing.

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

No.

- The cofinancing under 1:1 is not acceptable.

- Without cofinancing, it is difficult to understand how US\$ 1.1 million in investments (component 3), among a US\$ 3.629 million project, can meet the proposed objectives. Correct and clarify.

Agency Response Co-financing of \$27,5 million has been assured.

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

June 1st, 2021

Addressed.

January 31, 2021

Please provide a list of studies and assessments developed during the PPG.

Agency Response

The following studies were completed:

- ? Guidance for Grant Making
- ? COVID 19 Risk and Opportunity Assessment.
- ? ESMS Screening Report
- ? Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)

Gender Action Plan Framework

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
June 1st, 2021

Addressed.

January 31, 2021

No.

- The core indicators do not seem realistic in the proposed conditions.
- The core indicators are supposed to reflect the obtained results from the whole project, meaning the GEF grant + cofinancing. It is therefore surprising to find (almost) the same targets between the PIF and the CEO endorsement while the PIF was conceived with \$145 million of cofinancing meanwhile the proposed project document includes a cofinancing of \$2.45 million. Please, explain.
- Please ensure that the targets between the different documents are consistent (portal, project document, and request for CEO endorsement).

Agency Response

- ? The core indicators should be achievable now that significant co-financing (\$27 million) has been secured.

The signed off PIF co-financing amount was \$36 million as opposed to the quoted \$145 million in previous iterations.

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

Yes. The problems, barriers and priorities are well described.

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

June 1st, 2021

Please, highlight the modified sections in the project document and the portal (if possible).

January 31, 2021

There is indeed a baseline scenario.

We however recommend to complete this baseline scenario with projects and initiatives supported by bilateral, multilateral partners, and NGOs in collaboration with concerned authorities (environment, agriculture, water, etc.)Please, complete.

Agency Response A summary of Past and planned actions and projects is given in Section 3.5.1

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

June 1, 2021

Not responded. Please, provide the revisions and highlight them in the project document and the portal.

January 31, 2021

Without further cofinancing and partnerships, the proposed scenario does not seem adequate. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project is developed under the LD1.1 objective.

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 1st, 2021

Addressed.

January 31, 2021

- We wonder what the notion of mainstreaming and large-scale impact expressed at PIF level mean now at CEO endorsement. The project seems quite isolated, as a stand-alone project. Please, clarify.

Agency Response The project is linked closely with existing LandCare projects as well as other government initiatives such as Working for Land. A number of NGOs and private sector partners such as Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), Conservation South Africa (CSA) and Meat Naturally have projects that will overlap with this GEF funded projects. The linkages, however, will only be known after the competitive bid process for implementing partners has been completed.

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

June 1st, 2021

Please highlight the revised sections, or provide the revised text.

January 31, 2021

We can understand the general reasoning, but we are facing difficulties to agree on the proposed targets under the different core indicators. Please, revise, and/or reinforce the reasoning.

Agency Response This has been reworded.

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

June 1st, 2021

Please highlight the revised sections, or provide the revised text. We see the section 4.4 p.90 in the prodoc, but no information has been updated in the portal under the section 7) on Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up. Please, correct.

January 31, 2021

The notion of innovation in the project should be further developed.

The potential for scaling up is integrated in the output 4.1.2.

Agency Response A section on innovation has been added (See Section 4.4. page 90)

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

NA

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
June 1st, 2021

Addressed.

January 31, 2021

- Several partners mentioned in the PIF are not included in cofinancing. We have interrogations about the level of engagement with all these possible partners. Please, develop and correct.
- You wrote in the request for CEO endorsement that country circumstances and priorities of identified cofinancing partners have changed. Please, clarify.

Agency Response Every possible effort was made to incorporate and utilise the expertise of the partners identified in the PIF. Two executing parties were selected to fulfil a number of activities: University of Limpopo and Sol Plaatje University. DFFE requested that additional partners should be selected through a competitive bid process once the project begins. This meant that private sector and NGOs were unwilling to commit co-finance before they were selected. Other partners identified during the PIF ? Land Bank, DBSA and World Bank, have concluded the then-identified co-financing projects, and therefore could not commit anything

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

Yes., there is a gender action plan, and gender-sensitive measures are included in the result framework.

Agency Response
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
June 1st, 2021

Addressed.

January 31, 2021

The role and importance of the private sector are elaborated.

However, their absence from cofinancing seems a problem. Please, clarify.

The role of the private sector as a investment, technical, or executing partner should be further developed. Please, complete.

Agency Response DFFE requested that private sector partners should be selected through a competitive bid process once the project begins. This meant that private sector and NGOs were unwilling to commit co-finance, investment or technical contributions before they were selected.

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
Yes.

Agency Response
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

June 1st, 2021

Not fully addressed.

- Based on the diagram p. 131, it seems that the project team should be based at DEFF, and not UNEP. Please, correct the sentence on the same page: "The PMU will be responsible for directing, supervising, monitoring and evaluation and coordinating project implementation and will be located within ~~UNEP~~ or DEFF offices.

- See also the comments on the budget below (Annex C).

January 31, 2021

Implementation arrangements

- The project arrangements should be completely revised. The separation of implementation functions performed by GEF Agencies and execution functions by Project Executing Entities is a key feature of the governance of the GEF partnership.

- Basically, we expect from IUCN, as the GEF Agency, to entail oversight of project execution to ensure that the project is being carried out in accordance with agreed standards and requirements?. This role includes project supervision and oversight.

- We expect a Project Executing Entity (EA) ? here the Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DEFF formerly DEA) in collaboration with the Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries in South Africa, to executes the GEF Project, or portions of it, under the supervision of IUCN. Execution includes the management and administration of the day-to-day activities of the project.

- These roles between IUCN and DEFF should be reflected in an agreement, explaining the chain of accountability in accordance with specific project requirements. Execution implies accountability for intended and appropriate use of funds, procurement and contracting.

- We expect DEFF undertake the execution of projects, implying the ability to manage and administer the day-to-day activities of a project. Execution functions are financed through Project Management Costs (PMC), which are funded partly by the GEF funding and partly by the counterpart funding of the beneficiary government or other co-financing resources. The EA ?reports and is responsible to the agency that carries out project implementation?

(http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf).

If DEFF is not qualified to ensure its role of execution, please see with the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS), Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD formerly DAFF), or South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI).

Agency Response The implementation arrangements have been revised and can be interrogated in Section 5.1 (Page 130)

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
Addressed.

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
Yes.

Agency Response
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
Yes

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

Yes.

Agency Response
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

June 2, 2021

Point taken on the text available p88 of the prodoc. Please, make the text coherent with the information proposed in the portal.

January 31, 2021

Maybe not enough explained, but there is a logic in the project to build the GEBs on social and economic benefits. Please, clarify.

Agency Response

The GEB's have been elaborated on in the ProDoc in Section 4.1 (page 88). Specific focus has been made on the impacts of the project on stimulating, supporting and mainstreaming a sustainable 'green' economy towards improving socio-economic wellbeing in economically marginal areas.

Please also see Section L: Benefits in the CEO Endorsement Request Letter

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2021

Portal: Annex E

- A table with a budget summary would be welcome.

- Please find the comments below made on the Appendix A: GEF Budget Template:

Basically, the project budget proposes series of contract for the Sol Plaatje University (SPL) ? 16 sub-contracts for \$740,494 (20% of the budget grant), the University of Limpopo (UL) ? 16 sub-contracts for also \$740,494, local contracts for \$1,133,828 (31%), the project team and M&E support (\$340,000, 9%), a technical capacity support (\$325,000, 9%), and a small grant program (\$350,000, 10%) for a total of \$3,629,816 of GEF resources.

This budget raises a number of technical questions, before the control quality:

- The implementation arrangements include a role to UNEP. Please, clarify the role of UNEP in the budget and its execution, as we do not find out any reference to UNEP.

- The Sol Plaatje and Limpopo Universities have a significant role in the project execution. We wonder if they are not having a role that should be led by local stakeholders (SLMP development, PRMP development, mainstreaming SLMP in existing structures, integration of LDN targets in the SLMP, various agreements). How do you anticipate the buy-in from local authorities and stakeholders?

- We take note of the assessments, studies, tools, proposed through these contracts, but it is not that easy to see how these contracts will allow 800,000 ha of landscapes under SLM, 150,000 ha of agricultural landscapes restored, and will benefit to 1,177,138 people. The way you defined ?beneficiaries? may be developed. Please, clarify.

- Except a part of the budget from the small grant program (less than 10% of the project budget), and \$232,994 for each region to implement restoration activities, we do not see significant investments on the ground to the benefit of smallholder farmer (access to finance, microfinance, access to seeds). Are you optimistic that the proposed training will be enough to produce the expected benefits in terms of SLM and restored lands?

- What the line 58 under Salary and benefits/staff costs means? This Technical and Capacity Support for an amount of \$325,000 is assigned to the component 2. Based on the formulation, it might be assigned to the pmc. Please, clarify.

- This budget is essentially designed with contracts for consultants (31%) and universities (40%). We take note of two contracts of \$20,000 for mainstreaming LDN targets in the Northern Cape landscape and the Limpopo landscape. However, the sustainability of the approach seems questionable. Please, clarify.

- The line 57 includes a national safeguard consultant (\$20,000) assigned to the M&E component. The justification of such budget in the M&E is not possible. It seems this budget should be assigned to pmc. Please, clarify and correct.

January 31, 2021

No.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

At PIF level, we highlighted some key points to check at CEO endorsement. Please, provide a table of response:

- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis.
- Confirm cofinancing.
- Confirm the participation of the private sector.
- Confirm gender differentiated information in the description, the analysis, the result framework, and indicators.
- Confirm the definition of the indicator 4.1 and justify the interest for global important biodiversity.
- Confirm the number of beneficiaries and the definition used.
- Develop the financing mechanisms to be tested and scaled up with the private sector and banks.
- Develop the implementation arrangements with local partners.

Agency Response

The following has been elaborated and developed during the project preparation phase:

GEF Comments	Response	Evidence
- Provide a comprehensive risk analysis.	Developed and elaborated during project preparation	Section 4.6 in ProDoc (Starting Page 118)
- Confirm cofinancing.	Confirmed during project preparation	See signed co-financing letters

- Confirm the participation of the private sector.	The private sector has been consulted and included in various components of the project	See Section 3.4 and 4.5.3
- Confirm gender differentiated information in the description, the analysis, the result framework, and indicators.	Developed and elaborated during project preparation. The results framework includes gender differentiation indicators and gender differentiation has been included in descriptions of the project, protect target areas and component descriptions	Project Results Framework (Section 2) State of Equality (Section 3.1.4) Component descriptions (Section 4.5)
- Confirm the definition of the indicator 4.1 and justify the interest for global important biodiversity.	Indicator 4.1 as per ProDoc is defined as the Allocation of public finance to support implementation of SLM policies and practices. The importance for biodiversity has been outlined in the description of GEB's	Project Results Framework (Section 2) Section 4.6 in ProDoc (Starting Page 118)
- Confirm the number of beneficiaries and the definition used.	1 177 138 beneficiaries (677 138 female and 500 000 male) Direct beneficiaries are defined as those individuals living within the landscape intervention areas and that would benefit from improved SLM practices that result in improved environmental or social benefits. This would be measured by the development and implementation of the regional Sustainable Land Management Plan (SLMP) and the community level PRMP.	Project Results Framework (Section 2)
- Develop the financing mechanisms to be tested and scaled up with the private sector and banks.	The development of the financing mechanism is proposed under component 3	Please see Section 4.5.3 in the ProDoS
- Develop the implementation arrangements with local partners.	The implementation arrangements have been outlined in the stakeholder engagement plan in the ProDoc.	Please see Section 6 in the ProDoc

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

- See the comments from Germany at PIF level:

- Did you contact the local GIZ office?

- Germany made a comment about the need about value chain approaches, and look for synergy with existing projects, as the E4D. Please, confirm you followed up this comment.

- Germany also recommended to develop synergy with the Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Forestry and GIZ projects as the Bush Control and Biomass Control Project. Please, confirm your follow up.

Agency Response

DFFE stated that collaboration with GIZ at this stage of the project planning was not required. Once the project begins, GIZ will be approached.

-This approach was taken during project preparation aligning proposed approaches with existing projects and key points within the value chains. Please see Section 3.5 for exploration of these synergies

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2021

The point will be reviewed in the project document and the portal when highlighted sections will be available. Thanks for your understanding.

January 31, 2021

Please, include responses to the STAP comments made at PIF level.

- We take note of the proposed Theory of Change. However, if the proposed ToC summarizes well the result framework, we are not clearly seeing the pathway for change. Some further explanations would be welcomed.

Agency Response The ToC has been extensively elaborated and updated during project preparation and the concern raised has been addressed. Please see Section 2.1 (Page 9) of the ProDoc.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

NA

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 NA

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 NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2021

The project cannot be fully reviewed. Please see the comments above, provide a version with the changes highlighted, report also the changes in the portal, and respond to the questions raised on January 31, 2021. Some clarifications were added to help your responses.

January 31, 2021

The PIF cannot be recommended yet. There are deep concerns about cofinancing, partnerships, and implementation arrangements. We would like to alert the GEF Agency about the upcoming constraint of time to avoid an automatic project cancellation.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/31/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**