

Resilient communities, land restoration and sustainable ecosystem management

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11212

Countries

Zambia

Project Name

Resilient communities, land restoration and sustainable ecosystem management

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

4/13/2023

Review completed by PM

5/17/2023

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 17, 2023

Thanks for the revisions. Comments are cleared now.

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks for addressing the comments. The focus on adaptation is now clearly defined to justify the LDCF funding for the project. Please see additional comments from BD perspective

-a: While we note funding has been shifted towards a majority of LD funding, the global significance of the biodiversity that will benefit from the project has still not been articulated and no BD-relevant core indicator has been added. Please revise. If BD is to fund restoration, please articulate in the PIF, as previously indicated, how the corresponding restoration activities will provide measurable benefits for biodiversity of global significance. As elaborated in the GEF-8 BD focal area strategy, demonstrating the global importance of the project's anticipated biodiversity benefit will most of the time involve justifying the project's contribution to the persistence of some biodiversity components - genes, species, or ecosystems - in relation to their worldwide extent or population size.

-b: : While we note funding has been shifted towards a majority of LD funding, the BD-1-3 entry point was chosen (restoration to benefit biodiversity of global significance) when the benefits of restoration activities to be funded for biodiversity of global significance has not been articulated. Please either articulate these benefits, and/or use the BD-1-4 entry point (Biodiversity mainstreaming).

For PPG phase:

c- The responses and addition of CCM-1-1 are noted, but please note that PV would be funded exclusive through CM-1-2 and biogas would be funded exclusively through CM-1-1. Hence, during PPG, if the project is confirmed to have activities related to off-grid PV systems, please ensure alignment with CM-1-2 and:

- report corresponding funding on CM-1-2 and report emission reductions generated by the PV systems on core indicator 6.2 (in addition of the target already reported on 6.1 related to interventions in the AFOLU sector). If the installed capacity thanks to the project is planned to be significant, please also report a target on Core Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology. Please also coordinate

- coordinate and build on the experiences and lessons learned of the GEF-7 Africa minigrids project in Zambia (UNDP, ID10814).

GEFSEC 29 April, 2023

a) The proposed project aims to utilize a significant funding from LDCF. However, the focus on tackling climate change impacts and supporting adaptation interventions appear to be quite light to justify LDCF funding. For example, in the summary, the first two context setting paragraphs do not fully emphasize climate risks and hazards and its impact on making communities and ecosystem vulnerable. The resilience and adaptation also seem more like a co-benefit rather than a clear intended objective, from the project objective statement. The concluding three points in the summary also do not explicitly mention climate adaptation e.g. resilient infrastructure, adaptation planning, etc. as an important element of the transformational approach. There is also a general lack of linkages between the three TF objectives to strengthen the case for an MTF. Please revise the rationale behind the project to further strengthen climate adaptation objective of the project. It is suggested that the project clearly highlights the climate vulnerabilities in the targeted region, state how further land degradation and biodiversity is exacerbating the vulnerabilities of people and ecosystem, and then propose how this project by integrating various elements takes a holistic approach to address adaptation and multiple environmental challenges.

Comment from LD team: The alignment with LD FA is very generic in the PIF.

Comment from BD team: - Output 2.3 dedicated to the expansion of biogas and household PV systems is not eligible for BD, LD or LDCF funding. It is however potentially eligible for CCM funding. Solar PV project could be eligible under CCM Objective 1.2 (Enable the transition to decarbonized power systems). Biogas could be eligible under CCM Objective 1.1 (Accelerate the efficient use of energy and material). Through objective CCM 1.1. the programming directions support technologies that better utilize wasted biomass resources, lowering fugitive methane emissions and generating a slate of lower-carbon products but project must demonstrate that the risks related to the feedstock supply to the biodigester as well as risks related to technology use will be properly managed.

Please :

- shift the funding of output 2.3 to CCM

- ensure alignment with CCM-1-1 and CM-1-2

-Clarify in the PIF whether any investment activity is expected under Output 2.3, or alternatively all activities under this Output technical assistance activities.

- Make sure all the co-benefits from the use of renewable energy technologies are reflected in the proposal

- report emission reductions generated by the expansion of PV systems on core indicator 6.2 (in addition of the target already reported on 6.1 related to interventions in the AFOLU sector). If the installed capacity thanks to the project is planned to be significant, please also report a target on Core Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology.

- be explicit in the PIF that this output will build on the experiences and lessons learned of the GEF-7 Africa minigrids project in Zambia (UNDP, ID10814) and outline plans to coordinate during PPG with that project, which aims to support access to clean energy by increasing the financial viability, and promoting scaled-up commercial investment in low-carbon mini-grids in Zambia with a focus on cost-reduction levers and innovative business models.

- The project intends to program \$3 million of BD STAR allocation and close to \$1 million of LD STAR allocation but the benefits for biodiversity of global significance are not articulated, targets on core indicators are mostly, if not all, LD-related, and interventions are mostly LD-relevant. If the design is to remain as proposed, please shift the funding towards a majority of LD funding. In any case, if BD funding is maintained, please justify the benefits for biodiversity of global significance (for instance, selected districts in the central province appear to overlap with some Key Biodiversity Areas. It is less clear for targeted districts in the southern province) and include targets on BD-relevant core indicators that are commensurate with the requested BD funding.

- In addition, the project intends to program all BD resources under BD-1-1, which is dedicated to protected areas, when the project does not include any work or target related to protected areas. Given the project's interventions, BD-1-4 (mainstreaming) and/or BD-1-3 (restoration to benefit biodiversity of global significance) are more appropriate, noting that, as articulated in the GEF-8 BDFa strategy, the BD FA will only fund cost-effective restoration activities that improve the status of biodiversity and are part of integrated landscape management approaches.

Agency's Comments

Agency responses 16 May 23

a- Please see the revisions to strengthen the rationale for BD programming. The projects will deliver significant BD benefits in miombo & mopane ecosystems of globally significant importance by restoring woodlands, mainstreaming BD into integrated landscape

management and promoting the sustainable use of resources. Core Indicator 4.1 has been added.

b- The rationale for BD-1-3 entry point has been strengthened, and BD-1-4 has also been added. The relative importance of programming under BD-1-3 and BD-1-4 mirrors the relative importance of targets under Core Indicators 3.2 and 4 (ratio of 1/3 ? 2/3).

Further comments for consideration during the PPG phase are well noted.

Agency responses 11 May 23

Response to LDCF-related comments:

The project narrative has been updated to strengthen the adaptation rationale and justify the request for LDCF funding. Relevant updates have been made across the document, including the project objective statement. The linkages between the TF objectives have also been strengthened in the project narrative to emphasize the case for a MTF.

Response to LD-related comments: alignments with the LD FA have been elaborated on across the document.

Response to BD-related comments:

Thank you for the suggestions. The rationale behind Output 2.3 is not the expansion of biogas and PV systems per say, but rather to introduce alternative fuel sources and renewable energy options to reduce the pressure on local ecosystems. So, while the output is now aligned with CCM 1-1, CCM 1-2 is not relevant as the project does not intend to support a transition to decarbonised power systems (the GEF-7 minigrids project is therefor also not relevant). The output has been updated accordingly, including clarification of co-benefits that will be realised.

Funding has been shifted towards a majority of LD funding as suggested and in accordance with the full flexibility of STAR. Additional detail has also been added on benefits for global biodiversity significance.

Well noted. BD-1-3 has been selected as requested.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments
GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

Please refer to the comment on the project summary above. The adaptation objective of the project needs to be strengthened to justify LDCF funding.

-Please include the GEBs to be delivered by the project in the summary.

Agency's Comments

Well noted. Please see above response. Adaptation objective and rationale of the project has been updated accordingly.

GEBs have been included in the project summary as requested.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 17, 2023

Thanks. Comment cleared.

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

We note the revisions to the objective. However, as written, the objective is now entirely focused on restoration, with adaptation, sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity conservation as mere results of the manner in which ecosystems would be restored. It does not seem appropriate and does not reflect the rest of the project. For example, activities supported under component 3 isn't necessarily driven only by restoration of degraded ecosystems.

The TOC doesn't reflect the CCM funding.

GEF Secretariat April 29, 2023

- a) The adaptation objective of the project is recommended to be made more explicit and stronger.
- b) The components 2 and 3 are repeated twice in the PIF with same outcomes and outputs. However, the GEF financing amount is different. Please clarify. If these are due to separate funding sources (LDCF, or BD, LD), it is recommended that outcomes and outputs are also relevant to the funding sources as some of the outputs are specific to a particular trust fund only.
- c) Please refer to the comments below regarding alignment with GEF 8 LDCF strategy. The project has the potential to make the alignment stronger by focusing on the three priorities of scaling up finance, whole of society approach and private sector and innovation. These priorities and alignment with one of the themes could be made clearer in the PIF.

Comments from the BD team:

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

- The objective is limited to 'promoting' sustainable resource management and biodiversity conservation, which is less ambitious than the project outcomes. Please revise the project objective to reflect an ambition that is commensurate with the funding request.

3.1 b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

- A significant number of outputs are formulated as outcomes (in particular outputs 1.1.1; 1.1.2; 1.1.3; 2.3; 3.2; 3.3 and to a lesser extent 2.1 and 2.2). Please revise to convey what the project will deliver in concrete terms, i.e. what is under its direct control. For instance, output 1.1.3 could be reformulated as 'Biannual (national/provincial/district-level) dialogues to promote policy coherence and implementation of sustainable resource management' instead of 'Clarity on policy coherence and implementation related to natural resources management'.

Agency's Comments

Agency responses 16 May 23

Please see proposed revised objective to reflect the scope of the project.

The ToC has been edited to reflect CCM, both in the diagram (see change in wording of Outcome 2.2 to reflect CCM : Reduced biodiversity loss from woodfuel harvesting **and efficient use of energy** and material by local communities) and in the narrative.

Agency responses 11 May 23

Response to LDCF-related comments:

- a) Well noted. Please see above response. Adaptation objective and rationale of the project has been updated accordingly.
- b) The repetition was due to the format of entering the information into the portal. This has been amended through restructuring of outcomes and clarification of which funding sources are relevant to which outputs and outcomes. See revised project overview table. Please note, however, that the M&E component should be intrinsically linked to both funding sources and has thus been retained in its original format. Any suggestion to further revise this during PPG stage, if needed, would be most welcome.
- c) Well noted. Alignment with the GEF 8 LDCF Strategy has been strengthened, by focusing more on the three priorities of scaling up finance, who of society approach and private sector and innovation.

Response to BD-related comments:

- a) The project objective has been updated accordingly, reflecting an ambition that is commensurate with the funding request.
- b) Well noted. The relevant output statements have been reformulated accordingly.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

While there is an important emphasis on youth in project components, the focus on gender could be made more stronger.

There is a dedicated component on M&E with an output related to knowledge which is fine.

Agency's Comments The project's focus on gender has been elaborated on further in the document.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Components are adequately funded now through different different trust funds.
Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

a) The use of LDCF resources for delivering adaptation benefits is not very clear from the project components. There is a generic approach for improved natural resource management and sustainable livelihoods for climate resilience. However, please clarify how these will be informed by climate factors (e.g. climate information services, climate data integration, flooding and drought vulnerabilities of target regions) and what specific adaptation solutions will be supported. If there is an assumption that any activity that will reduce land degradation or biodiversity loss will naturally lead to adaptation, please elaborate on this reasoning in the PIF.

Also, as indicated above, it is suggested that there is clear articulation of components, outcomes and outputs relevant to the different trust funds used. This can then be complemented by a narrative to define how bringing these funds together can deliver benefits across LD, BD and CCA with potential of delivering results which are more than sum of parts.

b) Yes.

c) Yes.

Agency's Comments

a) The project description has been updated to clearly show where adaptation benefits will be delivered, including how approaches will be informed by climate factors and potential adaptation solutions to be supported.

Clear articulation of components, outcomes and outputs and different trust funds used has been made. The description of why a MTF approach has been selected has also been strengthened in the narrative.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

a) Please describe the climate vulnerabilities including climate hazards of the intervention areas in paragraph 16, which the project will target.

b) Under barriers, please clarify if lack of integrating climate change impacts and data in land management and livelihood is one of the barriers behind design and implementation of adaptation solutions. Also, is there sufficient institutional capacity to comprehend and apply climate factors in land management, agriculture and other sectors? A brief articulation of "enablers" will be useful in this section.

Comments from BD team:

- Please justify the global biodiversity significance of the targeted sites in this section. As elaborated in the GEF-8 BD focal area strategy, demonstrating the global importance of the project's anticipated biodiversity benefit will most of the time involve justifying the project's contribution to the persistence of some biodiversity components - genes, species, or ecosystems - in relation to their worldwide extent or population size. Proponents are invited to use criteria commonly used to identify areas for biodiversity conservation, but other well-justified criteria will be accepted with consideration for the specific project context and data availability.

•Our understanding of Zambia's agriculture is that it is overwhelmingly based on monoculture, rain-fed maize and is thus highly vulnerable to climate change (Ngoma et al. 2021). Please clarify why this is not highlighted in the situation analysis, and why crop diversification is not included as a major intervention pathway to improve climate resilience, biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Agency's Comments

Response to LDCF-related comments:

- a) The climate vulnerabilities and hazards of the intervention areas have been further described. Additional assessments will be conducted during the PPG phase.
- b) Barriers have been reassessed and updated accordingly. A brief articulation of enablers has also been added to this section.

Response to BD-related comments:

Justification of the global biodiversity significance of the target sites has been added to the project rationale section.

The use of reliance on monocropping and consequent vulnerabilities has been presented in the situation analysis ? please see highlights. However, this has been elaborated on as requested. Furthermore, crop diversification has been mentioned as a potential climate-smart agriculture intervention to be implemented under Output 3.1 ? this has been highlighted for convenience.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment is cleared for PIF stage. Further elaboration of this is requested at the PPG stage. The PIF proposes to do vulnerability assessments and livelihoods option analysis which can inform this.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

- a) In general yes but please elaborate how the project will address key vulnerabilities articulated in the PIF in sectors such as agriculture and fisheries where climate adaptation solutions are not scaled up due to various reasons. Would supporting sustainable land management and promoting alternate livelihoods directly deliver transformative adaptation for communities who rely on these sectors for their livelihoods? Can the project benefit communities better by focusing on activities which directly support adaptation in these sectors. Para 14 of the prodoc says " Smallholder farmers also have poor access to mechanization, irrigation technologies, skills training in sustainable agriculture techniques, weather monitoring data, early warning systems, credit financing and insurance, which reduces their capacity to adapt to climate change impacts." These are very useful and effective issues identified in the situation analysis in the PIF. However, the project approach doesn't address many of these issues which are also identified as important entry points in the GEF 8 LDCF strategy.
- b) Please refer to the comment above.
- c) Yes. The project should also build on the GEF 7 drylands IP in Zambia.
- d) Yes.

Agency's Comments

Agency response 16 May 23

Further comments for consideration during the PPG phase are well noted.

Agency response - 11 May 23

- a) These issues and entry points have been addressed in the PIF and are highlighted within Output 3.1's description.
- c) Well noted. The GEF-7 Drylands IP has been referenced. Alignments will be further explored during the PPG phase.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

a) The ToC will also benefit from an articulation of the climate adaptation and environmental degradation issues (as the starting block) that the project will target. Please refer to the climate adaptation decision tree paper by

STAP. https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-05/EN_GEF.STAP_C.62.Inf_10_A_decision_Tree_For_Adaptation_Rationale.pdf

- Please (i) add a discussion of why the project's causal pathways are both necessary and sufficient to achieve the project objective, and (ii) link assumptions to specific causal links in the ToC diagram.

-The project intends to target youth as agent of change, which is welcomed, and several ingredients that could promote behavior change (information, incentives, maybe) seem to be present in the design. However, the approach is not fully articulated in the ToC, which does not explain how these ingredients will combine and are integrated in a comprehensive strategy. From the ToC diagram, the project can even be read as relying almost only on awareness raising / information to foster behavior change. Please see the 6 levers for behavior change identified by STAP

(<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavioral-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it>) and further articulate and complement as necessary the project's approach to behavior change.

2. Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

●Output 1.1.3: please clarify at what scale the biannual dialogue are to be held (national? Provincial?)

●Output 1.1.4: Please clarify how biodiversity will be integrated into the planning process to ensure that resulting land use and land management plans contribute to deliver biodiversity benefits.

●Output 1.1.5: Noting the successful cash transfer schemes rolled out in Zambia to deliver non-environmental benefits, including demonstrated impacts on household resiliency of unconditional cash transfers (Lawlor et al 2017), we welcome the idea of piloting such a scheme to deliver environmental benefits. Please clarify the source of the cash (GEF / LDCF grant?), and on what type of results the cash transfer would be based. We recommend including an impact evaluation (RCT) as part of the design of this pilot, which could be included in output 4.1 and could assess both the environmental impact and effect on resiliency of the cash transfers. Conditional cash transfers for adaptation (India's MGNREGS scheme) and ecosystem services (Costa Rica's PES) can be effective if designed and managed well. Please see <https://www.iied.org/10197iied> This is a highly innovative aspect of the project which could be quite core to the project design. The intervention however doesn't articulate any adaptation linkage of the cash transfer/social protection.

●Output 2.2: The prevention, control and management of invasive alien species is not eligible for funding as described in this output. Please delete.

●Output 3.2: Please clarify what type of value chains are considered and confirm that this output would entirely contribute to diversification out of the predominant maize monoculture system.

●Output 1.2.1- could also include awareness about impacts of climate change, maladaptation and adaptation solutions.

Output 2.2- please specify "the climate resilient management" aspect of this output. How will the project ensure that the management of land is climate resilient?

Agency's Comments

a) Well noted. The ToC has been updated accordingly.

Discussion on the project's causal pathways has been included in the project description.

Well noted. The project's approach to behaviour change has been further articulated in the project description.

b) The outputs mentioned above have been updated according to the requests provided. Please see project description section.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

Paragraph 17-19 provides useful narrative on this. However, please refer to the previous comments regarding a general lack of directly targeting climate vulnerability drivers and supporting more holistic adaptation solutions. In this context, the incremental reasoning will benefit from clear alignment with GEF 8 LDCF priorities such as scaling up finance, whole of society approach and private sector and innovation. The alignment of the project with these priorities can be strengthened. In terms of alignment with themes, the project has good alignment with the nature based solutions thematic priority but it lacks articulation that proposed nature based solutions)e.g. sustainable land management can deliver adaptation benefits for the communities.

Agency's Comments Well noted. The incremental/additional cost reasoning has been updated accordingly.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023- Comment cleared.

The list of executing partner is fine. GEF Agency is not listed as an executing agency which is fine. Please indicate where is the institutional arrangement and coordination framework for this project is described in the PIF, to enable review of the same.

d) This is fine.

Agency's Comments A paragraph has been added in the section ?Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comments cleared.

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

1. This comment has not been addressed. Please see first comment box.
2. Thank you for the EX-ACT sheet. However, the assumptions for the mitigation calculations, as shown in the Ex-ACT sheet, are not consistent with the core indicator targets. According to the EX-ACT sheet, the project would have an impact over more than 450,000 ha, including ca. to 290,000 ha of forests and more than 160,000 ha of croplands, when the targets on GET core indicators only total 290,000 ha. Please revise to ensure consistency and ensure conservative mitigation target at this PIF stage. The target currently seem very ambitious relative to GET funding.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

- The project has the potential to target core indicator 5 of LDCF with focus on entrepreneurs in the value chains of various livelihoods options including related to agriculture. Please consider adding this.

- The project includes targets related to restoration, with no justification of anticipated benefits for biodiversity of global significance from these restoration activities, and sustainable land management in production system. Hence the project does not have BD-related targets when most of its GET funding it from the BD focal area. Please see first comment box and correct.

-The total GEF core indicator targets are 290,000 ha, which is small relative to the GET funding request, especially given the significant LDCF funding request and total co-financing. While restoration can be costly, we note that it is anticipated that a good share of restoration activities will be passive restoration. Hence, please revise the targets to achieve an acceptable cost-effectiveness in the delivery of global environmental benefits or thoroughly justify the cost assumptions and cost effectiveness of the project as proposed.

-Core indicator 6: The duration of accounting should be 20 years, not 5. Please correct.

-Core indicator 6: Please provide a justification for the target, i.e. main assumptions and the Ex-ACT sheet or equivalent. The Ex-ACT sheet is mentioned in the PIF but does not appear to have been uploaded in the portal.

Agency's Comments

Agency response - 16 May 23

1. Please see response to first comment.
2. This has been revised, with the EX-ACT calculations now covering 290,000 ha of forests.

Agency response - 11 May 23

Thank you. A relatively modest target for Core Indicator 5 has been added, with the understanding that it relates more to larger private sector enterprises, while the project focuses on small-scale entrepreneurs at the community level.

Please see response to previous comment.

The budget allocation for restoration activities under Outcome 2 have been updated. While we note that there will be passive restoration, the inputs and logistics required to restore 90,000 ha of degraded land and improve the management of a further 200,000 ha are immense, particularly over early phases (during project implementation). The targets are, we believe, cost effective, which will be confirmed by further budgeting and cost-effectiveness analysis to be undertaken during the PPG phase.

Apologies for this oversight - the duration of accounting was indeed 20 years in the original calculations. This has been addressed.

The EX-ACT sheet has been uploaded. All assumptions used are summarized in the ?Calculations? tab of the EX-ACT spreadsheet.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

a. Please refer to the comment above regarding integration of different elements of the project to make it truly integrated and transformative.

b. Potential of innovation and scaling up is there.

c. Yes

Agency's Comments a) Well noted. Please see responses to previous comments.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 17, 2023

Thanks. Comment cleared.

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

The alignment has not been described. Please provide some explanation. It just lists the relevant priorities in the GEF 8 strategy.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

The LD alignment is generic at this stage. Please specify more.

The alignment with the two LDCF priorities of whole of society approach and private sector/innovation is mentioned but not sufficiently embedded in the project rationale, components, outcomes and outputs. The proposed cash transfer scheme can also potentially contribute to scaling up of finance for adaptation objective. A stronger focus on core agriculture and fisheries adaptation solutions can make the alignment stronger with the first theme of the LDCF strategy.

- As already commented on, the project as proposed is weakly aligned with the BD focal area. Please see first comment box, correct and consider shifting the FA funding.

Agency's Comments

Agency response - 16 May 23

Explanation of the alignment has been added.

Agency response - 11 May 23

The LD alignment has been strengthened as requested.

Well noted. The PIF has been updated accordingly to strengthen the alignment with LDCF priorities. A stronger focus on agriculture solutions (including aquaculture) is included, however, the need for fisheries interventions in the target areas was not highlighted as a key adaptation need. Hence it has been given less attention.

Well noted. Please see responses to previous comments.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment cleared at the PIF stage. These are proposed under resilient livelihoods component and also proposed to be reviewed further at PPG phase through a livelihoods needs assessment. We would like to see this elaborated further at PPG stage and integrated more centrally in the project design.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

Yes. A stronger focus on core agriculture and fisheries adaptation solutions can make the alignment stronger.

Agency's Comments

Agency response - 16 May 23

The comments for further consideration during PPG phase are well noted.

Agency response - 11 May 23

Noted. Please see above response.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 17, 2023

Thanks. Comment cleared.

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thank you for the revision. However, please remove GBF targets 6 and 19 as the project does not contribute to these targets. Please justify contribution to targets 5 and 9, which does not seem obvious at PIF stage, or delete these targets.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

The PIF only identifies its contribution at the Goal level. Please map contributions to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework at the Target level.

Agency's Comments

Agency response - 16 May 23

These targets have been removed.

Agency response - 11 May 2

Contribution to the Kunming-Montreal targets is mentioned in the section ?Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities?

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments Yes. Please refer to comments above regarding LDCF funding justification.

Agency's Comments Please see responses to comments above.
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments
8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEF Secretariat May 16, 2023

Thanks. Comment Cleared.

GEFSEC- April 29, 2023

Yes. to justify CCM 1, please provide a clear narrative. It is expected that CCM benefits will accrue from carbon sequestration and clean energy interventions. Please provide a narrative as the CCM intention of the project is not reflected in the project outputs and outcomes.

Please also refer to comment above regarding alignment with CCM FA.

Agency's Comments Please see relevant responses above.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments Yes. The PIF is recommended.

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

During PPG, please address the following comments:

- ?An Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) should be developed during the PPG stage based on appropriate environmental and social risk assessment?

- refine outcome 2.2 and underlying output to ensure their alignment with CM-1-1 and/or CM-1-2. It will include revising the output and outcome formulation to reflect the anticipated mitigation benefits, and ensure the mitigation target reflects the results of the

corresponding activities. Please coordinate with, and build on the experiences and lessons learned of, the GEF-7 Africa minigrids project in Zambia (UNDP, ID10814).

Refine targets on GEF core indicators, and notably explore ways to improve the project's overall cost-efficiency in the delivery of global environmental benefits, or thoroughly justify in the CEO endorsement requests the cost assumptions and cost effectiveness of the project.

- Refine the approach to behavior change. The project indeed intends to target youth as agent of change, which is welcomed, and several ingredients that could promote behavior change are already included in the design. Please see the 6 levers for behavior change identified by STAP (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavioral-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it>) and further articulate and complement as necessary the project's approach to behavior change during project development.
-
- Elaborate on the resilient livelihoods and climate adaptation interventions further to respond to the climate vulnerabilities and associated barriers.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/29/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		