



Global coordination project for the SFM Drylands Impact Program

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10253

Countries

Global

Project Name

Global coordination project for the SFM Drylands Impact Program

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

3/17/2021

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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 N/A

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

01/21/2021: Not fully.

The co-financing commitment letter indicates all co-financing is in kind. Please clarify what the category "other" refers to in the Table C and if the definition of Investment mobilized is appropriate.

03/17/2021: Addressed

Cleared

Agency Response The co-financing classification as entered in the portal has been corrected: all co-financing is in-kind, as stated in the co-financing letter.

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

01/21/2021: Not fully.

Table D is adequate.

The budget is not considered cost-effective. The following recommendation are made for budget revisions:

- The professional salaries are with 29% of the total budget comparably high as compared to e.g. the FOLUR IP (16%) or the Congo Basin IP (20%). Further, professional salaries are charged to project components beyond the PMC ceiling. In order to justify, please provide these positions? TORs indicating clear deliverables tied to each project component and related project outputs where associated staff costs are charged. General TORs with only general coordination and management and supervision tasks would not justify budget charges to project components.

- Are there any possible cost savings between staff costs and consultant costs where consultants are hired to do similar tasks as staff? The budget indicates some possible synergy between consultants and staff positions, such as on coordination, on capacity development and knowledge, on communication and administration, and on operations.

- In the context of the overall arrangement in the DSL IP program where the GCP will support program-wide capacity building, knowledge management, monitoring, and technical expertise to address common management challenges, please explore the potential for strengthening the budget lines that provide this support through international expertise with a view towards complementing available national expertise in child projects.

- Please reconsider/justify the cost calculations for the three REMs. In view of the program having only 1 country in the Sahel/GGW REM and 2 countries in the Central Asia REM, the costs may be much lower than for the REM for the 7 Miombo/Mopane countries.

- Please clarify the "national consultants" positions - which countries' nationals are envisaged?

- Please note that under workshops: GEF assembly/council and UNCCD COP participation are not considered eligible expense items as these are usually funded already by other sources.

03/17/2021: Addressed. Budget has been revised.

Cleared

Agency Response

- We would suggest that the level of budget for professional salaries, as a proportion of the total, is realistic given that a) this DSL IP is smaller overall than the FOLUR IP, meaning that there are fewer opportunities for economies of scale and b) the DSL IP is significantly more complex, thematically and geographically, than the Congo Basin IP. The terms of reference for these positions have now been included, clarifying their contributions to the delivery of technical outputs and outcomes.

- The four HQ-based staff members are necessary in order to ensure that the full institutional value-added of FAO will be brought to bear, and that there is programmatic coherence and consistency across the IP. These staff members will separately also be engaged in the FOLUR IP, a situation which will allow synergies across the broader GEF-7 programmatic portfolio.

-The ToRs and titles of the key staff and consultancy positions have now been revised, to make clearer the complementarity, and lack of duplication, between them. For example, the Program Coordinator (staff) is responsible for overall IP technical oversight, whereas, in alignment with the REM strategy, the Regional Facilitator (consultant) is specifically responsible for supporting southern Africa child project teams in addressing technical issues that are specific to the region, as well as supporting countries in addressing common barriers, and linking the child projects to existing regional platforms (e.g. SADC and the Miombo network) and the private sector; and the Program Officer ? Capacity and Knowledge (staff) is responsible for coherent and effective program-wide approaches to capacity development and knowledge management (including flows of knowledge to and from global knowledge hubs), while the Communications and Outreach Specialist (consultant) is focused on ensuring effective scaling of project inputs.

- The restriction on sharing the costs of international consultants between the GCP and child projects limits the number of such consultants that can be included in the GCP as well as the duration of their assignments. Nevertheless, the GCP technical budget lines have been expanded to complement the available expertise at national child project level covering program-wide capacity building, knowledge management, monitoring, and relevant technical expertise.

- The costs of the West Africa, East Africa and Central Asia outreach have been reviewed in discussion with the co-executing partner IUCN, taking into account that; (a) on the one hand, the scale of effort in any given outreach is not necessarily proportional to the number of IP-participating countries that it includes (in the regions with fewer countries, addressing transboundary issues and regional-level scaling, both of which are at the heart of IP logic and requires a greater level of investment ? beyond the budgetary scope of the IP child projects ? in outreach and engagement of neighbouring non-IP countries in the region); and (b) on the other hand, costs have been minimized as far as possible by taking advantage of the existing structures to which IUCN has access and can leverage on in these regions.

IUCN?s overall support to the GCP has been reduced (from 2.4 USDM to 1.7 USDM) and clustered under one contract now (as an Operational Partner Agreement is envisaged) and will comprise of building policy coherence and alignment from global to regional and national level, overseeing that gender sensitive approaches are followed in all the child projects (gender expert), targeted studies based on identified management challenges (with focus on restoration and rangeland management), implementation and domestication of commitments through multi country actions, private sector engagement, targeted trainings and workshops. The outreach approach and activities for West, East Africa and Central Asia building upon existing mechanisms and platforms is outlined in Annex O, P, Q.

- The national consultants positions (which will be limited to the Miombo REM) will be nationals of the host country of the REM. These positions have been reduced to a

minimum (Regional Facilitator and admin/finance support); the national communication officer and KM officer have been removed, and their functions will be covered by the GCP.

- UNCCD COP budget line has been removed.

Note: - Additional budget refinements were conducted to respond to informal comments received from the GEFSec.

References: Annex F and L (uploaded into the portal).

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

However, please copy and paste overview table in Annex C of the portal.

03/17/3021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Done

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

01/21/2021: The core indicators have been estimated as 10% increment on the total program targets, which is realistic.

However, core indicator 6.1 may need to be adjusted as the child project in Burkina Faso has an unrealistic high carbon benefit target.

03/17/3021: Values have been adjusted. However, the justification is not considered adequate. Please provide better justification or revise the targets, keeping in mind that Core Indicators are designed to (i) capture direct results of GEF investments; and (ii)

targets should be reasonable in view of project funding (GEF finance + co-finance, but noting that co-finance is all in kind).

Please consider building on the Regional Exchange Mechanisms, and demonstrate opportunities for scaling out the impact that would be adjusted / estimated for each sub-cluster, based on the level of available funding (co-financing) and the level of regional coordination. Coordination and knowledge sharing actions can definitely be expected to generate a catalytic effect that will reach additional areas beyond the target areas of each national project. Further, the number of beneficiaries can be made more concrete as a result of persons benefitting from the engagement with and knowledge management activities of the GCP. In this context, it would be helpful if the REM would also be part of the theory of change to clarify on how it can generate GEBs along the presented pathways.

04/09/2021: Addressed (in the portal and in below response).

Cleared

Agency Response

03/28/21

The table in Annex M, showing a uniform programme-wide core indicator increment of 10% across all child projects due to the effect of the GCP in catalysing scaling-out, has been replaced by a new table showing estimated differences among sub-clusters in the scaling-out effect that will be facilitated by the respective REMs. The GCP/REM increments are now conservatively assumed to apply only to core indicators 4.1, 4.3, 6.1 and 11, as these are the variables that are most susceptible to scaling out effects.

A footnote has been added to Annex M explaining that the ?REM increments? for each sub-cluster (i.e. the additional core indicator impact resulting from the catalysis of scaling out due to the REM) are estimated to be approximately 10% overall for each of the highlighted core indicators. This effect is expected to vary among sub-clusters in proportion to the magnitude of the budget of the REMs relative to the total child project investments in each sub-cluster, given the assumed ?multiplier effect? that the REMs are expected to achieve by virtue of their roles in facilitating linkages (including knowledge flow) between the child projects and other projects and programmes through which scaling out is expected to occur. Programme-wide, the increment is still assumed to be approximately 10% on top of the total core indicator values across all child projects.

It is also expected that the magnitude of scaling out in each sub-cluster will be dependent on the magnitude of other projects and programmes (including neighbouring countries), that the REM is expected to influence and that may serve as channels for

scaling (e.g. expected investments in support of the GGWI expansion to Southern Africa, recent pledges for upscaling the GGWI in the Sahel as well as donor funding for LDN related work in Central Asia): it is not, however, possible to estimate the magnitude of these investments at this stage, so the estimates of GCP/REM increments by sub-cluster will be adaptively adjusted during project implementation as this information becomes available.

Further, the role of the REM in contributing to the GCP increment is now emphasized in paragraph 52 (theory of change): the REMs and their roles are in addition already explained in detail in paragraphs 57-66.

The targets for Burkina Faso and Angola have been corrected and the corresponding values for the GCP adjusted as a result.

Reference: Table F, Annex F, Annex M

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N.A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

n/a

This is a global coordination project that supports activities in the child projects under the program.

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

However, please take into account as appropriate the following observations and
recommendations:

Regional summary and overview of private sector engagement potential

Overall, the child country projects and proposals for private sector engagement are well
aligned with the GEF PSES, although connectivity through value chains and access to a

wide range of value chain actors (financial, logistics, ITC, traders) is limited in most cases.

Local Green Value Chain initiatives relevant to the specific eco-agroecological zones and local conditions create a challenge to link to major business or multi-stakeholder platforms without a logical connection or business entry points.

However, shared common challenges that could be supported by an integrated approach across the region, or at least in multiple countries, have a great deal of potential to achieve scale, engage the private sector, and form larger PPPs.

It is noted that:

Countries in the Miombo cluster not only share similar ecosystems unique to Southern Africa?Miombo-Mopane Woodlands?but face common challenges, including transfrontier ones, with respect to land management. Countries participating in Child Projects of the ?Miombo Cluster? will seek strategic and conceptual cohesion through regional collaboration and peer learning opportunities to help address these common challenges and, with support from regional bodies and partners, devise solutions that can be shared across Southern Africa.

Ideally such regional collaboration could include the private sector as part of multi-country partnerships:

The regional aspect can also facilitate local stakeholders? access to a wider range of different opportunities. Certain products are on high demand across the entire region and reaching global markets (e.g. marula oil). For private sector players, it implies broader connections and the expansion of their potential to reach multi-country supply partnerships. For the local value chain participants, the kind of scale enabled through the DSL IP will allow them have access to innovations they would otherwise not have imagined.

Overall, directly engaging the private sector in local activities is going to be a challenge for the larger companies and multi-stakeholder platforms and so aggregated and regionally directed approaches encouraged by the global project could be considered. Activities that engage the private sector in ?scaling out? through replicability, knowledge transfer, scaling of activities and the economies of broader coverage can then reach more widely into each individual project area and be examined or developed through the FFS model or FFPO.

The activities that are common across the region and many sectors could benefit from a regional approach to engaging the private sector, including:

- ? Payments for ecosystem services, especially carbon sequestration, under standardized or harmonized approaches

- ? Charcoal production from sustainably managed sources
- ? Crop alternatives/diversification to support smallholder resilience
- ? Plant protection and nutrition initiatives to boost productivity and reduce negative impacts such as nitrogen run off and GHG emissions

A regional vision for private sector engagement

The private sector would be attracted to large visionary initiatives across the region such as the SADC-orchestrated Great Green Wall Initiative of Southern Africa, whereby each country should work to document a commitment to a regional vision, creating the scale needed to bring the investment needed.

Such programs could support numerous private sector targets such as the Bonn Challenge, commitments under the Conventions, net zero emissions goals and biodiversity targets.

A recommendation is to create an investment prospectus that can attract the larger platforms and be used by Agencies, GEF Sec and partners to promote PPPs and private sector engagement across the region.

Further suggestions

The use of big data and digital technologies to assess climate change impacts, weather and data services, spatial planning, water resources management and digital platforms/information clearing house mechanisms for storage, management and analysis of LD and LDN-related data.

Herd management and genetics, stock feed to improve overall productivity and reduce landscape impacts.

Economic opportunities under the initiatives of the AfCFTA could also prove valuable in regional cooperation and also in scaling for markets outside of the region, into RSA, East and West Africa.

Although barely mentioned in the child projects, irrigation development and water resources development may also be a longer term goal, especially under climate change, and include the provision for local and regional water storages, on-farm storage and irrigation approaches.

Key companies/platforms that would have an interest in participation:

- ? Carbon / PES ? major extractive industries, Business for Nature
- ? Charcoal ? CMO Global, FSC, Aldi and Lidl.

- ? Crop protection ? Corteva (fall army worm) and Syngenta (cereal crops and seeds), Food Systems Summit
- ? Plant nutrition ? Yara, Nutrien, UPL, Food Systems Summit
- ? Landscape restoration and crop diversification ? PMI, JTI
- ? Regional farm forestry

The GEF Secretariat and the GEF CEO, the Private Sector Advisory Group members and GEF private sector partners can be used to support the multiple goals of a visionary initiative and include a raft of actors not present in the landscape but with investment goals consistent with the SDL IP objectives. Such partnerships could also provide the robustness and durability needed to create lasting change in these landscapes.

03/17/3021: Addressed. Recommendations have been taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response These recommendations are well noted and will be taken into account during project implementation.

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

However, please also provide a brief assessment of the opportunities that may arise by the child project's efforts of "building back better" and outline in what way the GCP can support such efforts.

03/17/3021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

Overall, the IP country projects will focus on the promotion of diversified, resilient and adaptive models of farming, livelihood and landscape management systems, together with inclusive value chains, that will help to buffer dryland communities' livelihoods and food security against current and future 'shocks' such as those associated with the current pandemic (e.g. disruption to off-farm income generation opportunities, food supply and markets for farm produce).

The GCP will play a key role in channeling information to child projects on the nature, magnitude and implications of threats such as COVID-19, alongside other factors including climate change; and channeling global knowledge to the child projects on alternative and innovative strategies for achieving resilience and building back better.

Relevant section (5) has been updated accordingly.

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

The arrangements are considered well-justified and adequate.

The Program Manager (PM) approves the exceptional arrangement that FAO will implement and largely execute this project. As this is a global project without STAR funding, the exception doesn't require OFP support letters. PM recommends Manager's clearance.

However, as FAO is the main execution agency of the project please list FAO in Part I as executing partner (instead or in addition to IUCN).

03/17/2021: Addressed.

The Program Manager (PM) approves the exceptional arrangement that FAO will implement and largely execute this project. As this is a global project without STAR funding, the exception doesn't require OFP support letters. PM recommends Manager's clearance.

Cleared

Agency Response Adjusted

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Not fully.

The approach is well-described and all elements presented throughout the documentation. However, in the KM section of the portal, please briefly indicate a rough timeline and the budget that has been set aside in the GCP for these deliverables.

03/17/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

An indicative timeline and the budget for KM have been included as requested (project document KM section).

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

01/21/2021: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Not fully.

While all Annexes are in the prodoc, please also copy and paste the relevant summary information into the portal Annexes A - F.

03/17/2021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Done

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Has been provided in the prodoc, please also paste into Annex A - F of the portal.

03/17/3021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Done

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Upstream GEFSEC comment were taken into consideration.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021:

The project document does not include Council comments that were made at PFD stage (while STAP, GEFSEC, and IUCN comments are included). Please include the relevant Council comments (Canada, Germany, US). There were also specific comments made on child projects, which also need to be addressed in the respective child projects (Zimbabwe, Namibia). Please also check if the comments are relevant for other child projects.

Additional comments will be addressed after the Council circulation period, if any.

03/17/3021: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response Responses to Council Comments have now been included (Annex B).

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Relevant STAP comments made on the PFD and upstream comments have been taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Upstream comments of UNCCD Secretariat were taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Upstream comments of IUCN, World Bank, and WWF-US were taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Upstream comments made by CSO reps during the partnership workshop were taken into account.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: Has been provided.

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

See comments above

Cleared

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response N/A

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/21/2021: No. Please address comments made in this review.

03/17/2021: No. Please address outstanding comment on the core indicator targets.

04/09/2021: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/21/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/9/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

This is the Global Coordination Project (GCP) under the Drylands Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program. It is fully in line with the programmatic objectives of the IP. By fostering transboundary outreach, scaling-up, global stakeholder engagement and system-wide capacity development, the GCP will be coordinating the child projects in the 11 participating countries. The GCP responds to the transboundary and regional nature of many of the threats and common management challenges in these countries, including regional demographic flows (seasonal or permanent migration), regional economic cooperation, transhumance, ecoregional biological connectivity, and transboundary flows of environmental impacts and services.

The GCP will help to ensure that the impacts of the program in terms of durable threat reduction are sustained both in the 11 target countries and beyond, in neighboring countries with similar conditions and challenges. It will benefit countries by facilitating participation in regional and global dialogues on drylands, linking up with public and private sector actors, and coordinating effectively with neighboring countries to address shared and/or transboundary issues.

The country projects will be supported in the promotion of diversified, resilient and adaptive models of farming, livelihood and landscape management systems, together

with inclusive value chains, that will help to buffer dryland communities' livelihoods and food security against current and future 'shocks' such as those associated with the current pandemic (e.g. disruption to off-farm income generation opportunities, food supply and markets for farm produce). In this context, the GCP will play a key role in channeling information to child projects on the nature, magnitude and implications of threats such as COVID-19, alongside other factors including climate change; and channeling global knowledge to the child projects on alternative and innovative strategies for achieving resilience and building back better.