



Combating land degradation and biodiversity loss by promoting sustainable rangeland management and biodiversity conservation in Afghanistan

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10169

Countries

Afghanistan

Project Name

Combating land degradation and biodiversity loss by promoting sustainable rangeland management and biodiversity conservation in Afghanistan

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/2/2020

Review completed by PM

1/28/2021

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

12/22/2020: 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

12/22/2020: Yes.

01/28/2020: ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION REQUEST:

Output 3.1.2. is to ?Provision of 10 small research grants for universities to conduct research ??. Considering that FAO will support executing functions, the description of FAO?s involvement in the financial management of such grants is currently insufficient as the responsibility of such grants rests in the Project Management Unit ?in collaboration with MAIL, NEPA and FAO?. Please present FAO's role for this output in such manner that it is clear that FAO will apply its minimum fiduciary standards in the oversight of the sub-grants.

Please address this comment by adding the respective text in the portal as well as in the respective tables in the project document that outline the responsibilities of the executing partners.

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

RE 01/28/2021

Additional clarification has been added in the CEO ER/ProDoc (*Section 3) Alternative scenario and Annex H work plan*), as well as in the budget file.

In consultation of the PMU, FAO will be responsible for establishing the criteria and the selection process for the provision of the grants in collaboration with MAIL, NEPA and Universities. The administration of the grants will be done by MAIL and regulated by FAO Manuals Section 507 (Letters of Agreement). FAO will apply its minimum fiduciary standards in the oversight of these grants.

Please note that additional small revisions have been made in the budget (reduced number of months of Senior Finance Officer, Procurement Officer and Driver budget lines and reallocated to field implementation).

A clarification has also been added in the work plan (Annex A2 in the ProDoc file) and the results framework to include more details on the capacity building provided to MAIL on project execution.

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Changes have been explained and justified.

01/12/2021: ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATION REQUEST.

While changes have been explained, please clarify why the project has so low BD related targets. For a project investing \$2.5 million in BD mainstreaming, we would expect higher targets under either 4.1, 4.2, or 4.4 and not only on 4.3. Please address.

01/28/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

The targets under Sub-Indicator 4.1 have been increased from previously 11,400 ha to newly 15,654 ha based on a review of the BD targets. The detailed calculations can be found in the revised budget file (?Calculations? tab) that has been uploaded in the Documents section of the Portal, and in the table below. (Note that, simultaneously and based on the discussion with GD-NRM, the forest restoration target has been increased from 800 ha to 1,000 ha.)

Additionally, a justification of the BD targets is provided below and has been added in *Section 6) Global environmental benefits*, as follows.

1. The Core Indicator 3 and 4 targets are explained in more detail in the table below. They are based on estimates elaborated in close collaboration with project stakeholders, based on the baseline assessments and experience from previous projects, including the GEF-6 ?Community-based sustainable land and forest management in Afghanistan? project. Sub-Indicator 4.1 is focused on areas of globally important biodiversity, and includes forest/rangeland areas that provide critical habitat for globally important wildlife species. A more detailed assessment of these areas will be conducted as part of Output 1.1.3. Additionally, the project will benefit from the ongoing work under GEF-6 to develop forest inventory and monitoring capacity. Taking into account the challenging environment in which the project will operate, the 15,654 ha under Sub-Indicator 4.1 are considered to be a measurable and realistic target within the project?s timeframe. The 88,346 ha under Sub-Indicator 4.3 capture biodiversity benefits that lead to physical improvements in the environment in

production systems (e.g., soil and soil carbon, nutrient recycling, diversity and functionality of vegetation cover, micro-climates, and water), in line with GEF definition of Sub-Indicator 4.3.

Finally, additional benefits to globally important biodiversity are eventually expected to result from the survey work in Nuristan National Park under Output 3.1.3; however, these will require more time and additional investments beyond the project duration.

2. Note: **Sub-Indicator 4.2** (Area of landscapes that meets national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations) is not considered relevant in the context of the target areas in Afghanistan, given the extremely challenging security and socio-economic environment. While Output 2.2.2 will aim to strengthen value chains for local products such as pine nuts, including potentially through a Geographical Indication System, a formal certification system is not considered feasible within the project timeframe, in particular given that the private sector is not yet well developed in the target areas. Similarly, **Sub-Indicator 4.4** (Area of High Conservation Value forest loss avoided) is not deemed applicable in the project context, in part due to insufficient detailed forest data currently available and the fact that forest degradation is more relevant than forest loss in the target area. Relevant HCVF areas that will be under improved management to reduce forest degradation, are included as part of Sub-Indicator 4.1.

	Area (ha)	Explanation
Core Indicator 3 (Restoration)	20,000	
Sub-Indicator 3.2: Area of forest and forest land restored	1,000	Forest included in CBNRM plans, for restoration/afforestation
Sub-Indicator 3.3: Area of natural grass and shrublands restored	19,000	Rangelands included CBNRM plans, for restoration/rehabilitation
Core Indicator 4 (Improved management)	104,000	
Sub-Indicator 4.1: Area of landscapes under improved mgmt to benefit biodiversity	4,000	Forest included in CBNRM plans, for improved management
	11,654	Area of critical ecosystems providing habitat for globally important wildlife species included in CBNRM and/or landscape management plans, for improved management

Sub-Indicator 4.3: Area of landscapes under SLM in production systems	88,346	Area covered by landscape management for sustainable land management
Grand total	124,000	

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
12/22/2020: 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
12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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
12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: 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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

12/22/2020: 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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

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

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

01/28/2021: ADDITIONAL COMMENT:

The reviewer understands that the stakeholder validation of the work plan, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and other plans did not take place due to the restrictions imposed by the pandemic. Please do proceed with that validation process at inception and document its results in the PIR at submission. Please acknowledge this comment in the response box below.

03/03/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response
RE 01/28/2021

The comment is acknowledged. We will proceed with the validation process at inception and document its results in the project Inception report and PIR.

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

However, COVID-19 risks and opportunities are only dealt with in the Risk table and the stakeholder engagement plan. Please work in the main points of the risk/opportunity assessment also in the component description as appropriate. For example, the outlined

CBNRM plan with the 8 steps would certainly face COVID-19 related risks/opportunities and other project implementation components as well. In those components, please include the main points and make cross-reference to the risk assessment.

01/12/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

RE 22 Dec:

Thank you for the suggestion. The COVID-19 related risks/ opportunities have been incorporated in the Component description in *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario*, as follows. *Section 5. Risks* has also been revised accordingly.

- **Component 1:** As explained in *Section 5. Risks*, activities under Component 1 may be affected by COVID-19 restrictions, in particular during Year 1, as they rely on consultations with national and local stakeholders. The project approach will need to be regularly reviewed and revised, if necessary, as part of the adaptive management approach. In particular, for the capacity development, consultations and planning activities at the national level, the project may need to shift to virtual/online meetings and training where feasible. The size of gatherings may need to be reduced to a smaller number of participants. For the local consultations and on-the-ground implementation (including the CBNRM planning process), the activities will be executed in close collaboration with provincial and local government and local community organizations, who have better access to the project sites. The capacity of local government staff and community organizations will be strengthened from the beginning of project implementation so that they can lead the local consultations and on-the-ground interventions, together with the provincial coordinators. The project will hire three Provincial Project Coordinators and three Community Mobilizer (one per province), who will be based in the field. If national travel is restricted, these coordinators will be briefed and trained remotely by the international and national experts. Additionally, COVID-19 prevention measures will be applied in all project activities, including the provision of personal protective equipment (PPE), thermal measuring equipment and training/awareness. Finally, the work plan in Annex A2 includes some margin to account for any delays that may occur.

- **Component 2:** Similarly to Component 1, the activities under Component 2 may be affected by COVID-19 restrictions, in particular during Year 1, as they rely on consultations and on-the-ground activities with local stakeholders as well as on national and international experts being able to travel to the field. As described in *Section 5*.

Risks, the size of gatherings may need to be reduced, and the project will build the capacity of the provincial coordinators, the local government staff and community organizations and will brief and train them remotely if needed. COVID-19 prevention measures will be applied to all project activities. The work plan will be reviewed and adjusted periodically in consultation with key project partners and stakeholders. Furthermore, project activities will aim to contribute to socio-economic recovery in line with the COVID-19 Humanitarian/Socio-Economic Response Plan for Afghanistan, by enhancing the natural resource base upon which rural livelihoods depend. The project will also provide technical guidance on animal health and the human-livestock-wildlife interface, building on FAO's ongoing technical assistance in Afghanistan.

- **Component 3:** Activities under Component 3 may also be affected or delayed by COVID-19 restrictions and adequate mitigation measures will be taken to adjust to the evolving situation, as described in *Section 5. Risks*. The size of gatherings may need to be reduced, and the project may need to shift to virtual/online meetings and training where feasible. Furthermore, activities under Component 3 will aim to enhance and support opportunities to contribute to socio-economic recovery in line with the COVID-19 Humanitarian/Socio-Economic Response Plan for Afghanistan, such as by increasing knowledge on the natural resource base upon which rural livelihoods depend.

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

12/22/2020: Not fully.

The execution support request submitted by the OFP and the additional justification provided has been approved by the Program Manager and will be submitted for clearance to the GPU manager when the project is technically cleared.

Meanwhile, in accordance with the exception request by the OFP, please add FAO as an co-executing agency in Part I of the portal.

01/12/2021: Addressed as per response below.


It is the first time that we encounter the issue that the system doesn't allow those changes. If the issue persists, I will check with IT and change from the back-end.

Cleared

Agency Response

RE 22 Dec:

Please note that the system does not allow additional executing agency to be inserted in Part I of the Portal. If there are ways to modify this section, could you kindly advise?

Other Executing Partner 	Executing Partner Type
Ministry of Agriculture, Irrigation and Livestock (MAIL)	Government

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

12/22/2020: Not fully.

The alignment with the national UNCCD strategies and action plans should elaborate more on the relation of this project with national LDN targets. It is not fully clear whether the country has set voluntary LDN targets and to what extent the project will contribute to the achievement of those targets.

It is also not fully clear to what extent the LDN guidelines/checklist have been used to address linkages between the project and the LDN agenda. This was also a STAP comments, which has been responded to, but only in general terms. Please elaborate briefly on how the LDN checklist was used in this regard in this section.

01/12/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

RE 22 Dec:

Additional explanations have been added in *Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities*, as follows.

Afghanistan has not yet set voluntary LDN targets and does not yet have a National Action Programme under the UNCCD. However, in its National Report to the UNCCD

in 2018, the country has set restoration and sustainable management targets based on its national policies such as the National Natural Resource Management Strategy (2017-2021). These targets include 500,000 ha of grassland restored and 72,000 ha of forests restored. In addition, the project was designed in light of the National Comprehensive Agriculture Development Priority Program (NCADPP) (2016-2020) and associated Interministerial Implementation Plan (2019-2023). Furthermore, it is in line with the National Dry Lands Agriculture Policy, National Drought Risk Management Strategy, National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. All these policies directly contribute to the implementation of the UNCCD in Afghanistan.

Finally, the project will support planning and coordination mechanisms that strengthen Afghanistan's capacity to implement its commitments under the UNCCD, in particular through the establishment of a national database on land degradation (Output 3.1.1) and by introducing the concept of land degradation neutrality (Outputs 1.1.1, 3.2.2). Under Component 3, data will be compiled to support future decision making and investments, in particular with regard to biodiversity and land degradation and related SDG indicators and natural capital accounts. This will also lay the foundations (capacity, data) for future LDN target setting.

Regarding the LDN checklist, additional information has been added in *Annex B: Response to Project Reviews*, as follows.

The project design team has applied elements of the LDN conceptual framework and checklist^[1] during the project preparation. Specifically, while the project design team strived to apply all principles of the checklist, the following were considered most relevant in the context of the project:

1. The project uses a landscape approach by choosing an area large enough to involve multiple land units of a variety of land types (Outputs 1.1.3-1.1.6).
 2. Elements of the response hierarchy (avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation) have been incorporated into the design of the project activities, through planning, sustainable management and regeneration/rehabilitation interventions (Components 1 and 2).
 3. Supports the development of a monitoring system consistent with national and Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) targets (Outputs 3.1.1, 3.2.2).
 4. Ensures the commitment to the principle of gender equality throughout the entire process (see Gender Action Plan).
-

5. Creates linkages to multiple SDGs by designing interventions that generate multiple environmental, economic and social benefits (all project components).
6. Provides economic incentives that benefit both men and women to improve livelihoods (Outcome 2.2).
7. Promotes land-use decisions based on an assessment approach (Outputs 1.1.3-1.1.6).
8. Safeguards land rights of local land users including individual and collective access to land, land tenure and resource rights, inheritance and customary rights (Output 1.1.4 and Risk section).
9. Defines mechanisms for ensuring the gender-responsive engagement of key stakeholders in project design and implementation (see Gender Action Plan).
10. Employs science-based and local and indigenous knowledge as well as best practices including sustainable land management that contributes to land-based climate change adaptation and mitigation (Outputs 1.1.3, 1.1.4).
11. Captures and disseminates what is learned from the interventions and identify ways to address knowledge gaps through accessing all knowledge forms, and where necessary conducting research (Outcome 3.1).

The project also addresses specific gaps with regard to elements of the LDN checklist. In particular, further strengthening of the country's capacity for data collection, management and sharing in relation to LDN is needed, which is addressed under Output 3.1.1. Relevant participatory assessments for the target districts have been included in Output 1.1.3, including socio-economic and gender considerations.

[1] <https://knowledge.unccd.int/knowledge-products-and-pillars/access-capacity-policy-support-technology-tools/checklist-land>.

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

12/22/2020: Not fully.

The KM approach of the project is described, however, in very general terms. Please elaborate with regard to a timeline and deliverables and how this has been factored in in the design of the respective component.

01/12/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

RE 22 Dec:

Additional information has been added in *Section 8) Knowledge management*. Under Output 3.1.4, the project will develop and implement effective knowledge management and awareness strategy, to support maximum outreach and replication of project interventions.

As soon as the Strategy is developed based on the lessons learned of GEF-6, the project will develop knowledge and outreach products and disseminate such as video/TV clips, audio/radio clips, posters, flyers, brochures, publications from the second/third quarter of the project up to the end of the fourth year of project life as indicated in the project work plan (Annex A2). Innovative information and mobile technology will be used to disseminate good practices. A concerted plan of deliverables will be developed based on the strategy and targets will be added in Annex A1 (results framework), in close coordination between MAIL and NEPA. The National ?Centre of Excellence? at MAIL will play a key role in knowledge creation and dissemination, as currently being established under GEF-6.

Knowledge management has been mostly factored in in the design of Component 3 through its Output 3.1.4. However, knowledge created in all project outcomes and outputs will be captured through this particular output.

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

12/22/2020: 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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

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

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: Yes. Has been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: Earlier comments at PIF stage have been adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: No. Council comment by Germany has not been responded to. It is pasted below for convenience. Please include response in the portal.

Germany requests that the following requirements are taken into account during the design of the final project proposal:

We suggest that the further project development ensures that all components and subcomponents are scheduled and organized in a way that they complement each other, thus ensuring effective and efficient execution. All linkages should be clearly presented and explained: Overall, further project development should focus on providing more details on planned activities for all outputs and how these are linked to each other.

Both component 1 and 3 include activities related to capacity building. The project should explain how these components relate to and build on each other. For example, any planned activities related capacity-building in management and policy under component 1 must integrate those stakeholder targeted under component 3 in order to ensure suitability of management and policy measures.

The project should further indicated how any capacity development activities under component 1, support activities envisioned under component 2.

In addition, in order to avoid disconnection between project activities and involved stakeholders, the project should outline a clear connection between components 2 and 3. For example, the stakeholder group ?farmers? should be included in activities under component 2 related to implementation of community-based management practices.

Under component 1, the project should explicitly indicate based on what analysis policy formulation will be carried out, which sectors are to be targeted by policy formulation as well as which stakeholders are to be involved in the process.

Under component 1, the project should further explicitly explain the target audience/users, expected benefits and maintenance options for the national database, indicators and monitoring system to be developed. These features may potentially entail a high demand in human and financial resources if to be maintained in the long-term. Therefore, a clear strategy for their long-term maintenance and management should be included.

Under component 3, the project should indicate the target audience for the knowledge products to be developed. Preferably, these products would be directly targeted at those stakeholders involved in all other project components.

Under component 3, the project should further indicate which policy recommendation, e.g. for which sectors, are to be supported by NEPA and how these related to policy formulation planned under component 1.

01/12/2021: Council comment has been responded to.

Cleared

Agency Response

RE 22 Dec:

The response has been added in *Annex B: Response to Project Reviews* of the Portal, as follows.

The following responses are provided:

a. As explained in *Section 1.a.8) Summary of changes in alignment with the project design with the original PIF*, during the project design phase, the interventions were elaborated more in detail (see detailed work plan in Annex A2). Some changes were made in the outputs and outcomes to better reflect the identified needs in the target areas and achieve the project objective. Organization of the components and sub-components and linkages between them were also improved, as described in the Component description and

Theory of Change in *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario*.

b. The outcomes and outputs related to the capacity building were also made clearer. The content of the capacity building program under Component 1 is described in detail in the component description and in the work plan, and will build closely on the outcomes of the GEF-6 project. Capacity building of local stakeholders (pastoralist field schools and learning sites) was moved to Component 2, as part of the field

implementation under Component 2. Additionally, very specific institutional capacity building of NEPA and MAIL related to GEF, CBD and UNCCD implementation was included under Output 3.2.2. Details are elaborated in Section 3) and the work plan in Annex A2 of the ProDoc. An additional clarification has been added in Component 3 description: ?The NEPA and MAIL stakeholders targeted for specific capacity development under Component 3 will also be engaged in the CBNRM capacity building program under Component 1 to ensure alignment and sustainability of the outcomes.?

c. *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario* explains how the enabling activities under Component 1 (CBNRM planning, capacity building, strengthening of RMAs/FMAs) lay the foundations for the implementation of activities under Component 2.

d. This has been resolved by moving capacity development of local stakeholders (pastoralist field schools and learning sites) to Component 2.

e. Based on the baseline assessments conducted during the project design phase, former Output 1.4 on policy recommendations was removed/partially integrated into Outputs 3.1.1, 3.1.4 and 3.2.2. This is due to the fact that national policy (see *Section 2) Baseline scenario* and *Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities*) already provides a sound basis for addressing BD, LD and NRM issues relevant to this project. Instead, it was considered important to build capacity for and support the implementation of existing policies (particularly, the NRM Strategy). Additionally, it was considered important to enhance the availability and use of data for future decision and policymaking, planning and mobilizing investments, and for LDN target setting.

f. The former outputs under Component 1 regarding national database were revised based on the baseline assessments and consultations during PPG, and moved to Component 3. Details are elaborated in the Component 3 description in *Section 3) Proposed alternative scenario* and Annex A2. The key roles of the ?Centre of Excellence for NRM? at MAIL as well as NEPA are explained in this section and in the work plan.

g. Details on the project?s knowledge management approach are elaborated in *Section 8. Knowledge Management*. It is specified that the KM strategy will target stakeholders in the target landscapes and beyond. Outreach to smallholder farmers, pastoralists, community associations, local government, civil society and the private sector will be conducted strategically and with a view for long-term sustainability of project interventions.

h. Outputs related to NEPA capacity building in Component 3 have been made clearer. Please refer to response e. above regarding policy formulation.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: Yes.

However, please note comment made on national alignment.

Cleared

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: Yes. Has been provided. The amount is utilized/fully committed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/22/2020: Yes. Has been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at 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

12/22/2020: No. Please address comments made in this review.

01/12/2021: No. Please address additional clarification request on core indicators.

01/28/2021: No. Please address one additional clarification request on output 3.1.2. (box 2) and on stakeholders.

03/03/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	12/22/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/12/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations