

Building the next generation LDN investment pipeline through national Technical Assistance Hubs

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11006

Countries

Global

Project Name

Building the next generation LDN investment pipeline through national Technical Assistance Hubs

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

2/27/2023

Review completed by PM

4/24/2023

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

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

03/01/2023: Yes. However, please address the following:

- Check for consistency in the project duration (36 months) and project start / end date, which indicates a different duration.

04/10/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

Dates have been changed in GEF portal.

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

03/01/2023: Yes. However, please address the following:

- In the section where changes to the PIF are described and justified, please refer to "WWF-US as the GEF implementing agency" and add that the change to CI as implementing agency was approved by GEFSEC.

04/10/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

Ok ? text added in paragraph 1

?1. The WWF-US GEF Implementing Agency was the original Executing Agency for this project during the PIF stage, though the project was transferred to CI-GEF during the PPG phase, as of October 19, 2022. The change to CI as implementing agency was approved by GEFSEC.?

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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: Table D is adequate, however, please address comments on the budget as presented in the Annex, the separate excel sheet, and in the project document:

- The budget is funds personnel to a large extent. Based on the TORs provided for the different positions, it seems that some of the personnel clearly has management tasks but do not charge to the PMC. This is especially the case for the National Project Manager, who would need to be charge proportionally to the PMC. Please also check the other TORs for consistency with the budget proposal.
- The budget includes "reimbursable grants of \$585,144. However, the project document only refers to "grants" of in total "710,532". Please make those figures and types of grants consistent. Further, it is noted that the fiduciary responsibility of the executing agency IDH is explained with regards to these grants, however, in this context CI as the implementing agency needs to provide oversight and state this accordingly, and briefly explain how.
- Further on those grants: Please provide more detail on the mechanism in the project document. And if they are reimbursable, briefly explain the mechanism etc.
- The budget mentions "scoping missions in 3 countries", however, the Table B and project concept only refers to one pilot country. It would be better at this point to limit this activity to "desk top studies and/or exchange of experience/opportunities with 3 countries", which may include missions if invitations are made by those countries.

04/10/2023:

1) Budget table: National Project Manager and Project Lead are charged to both project components and PMC. Per GEF guidelines, this position has to be charged to the co-financing portion and the GEF portion allocated to PMC - there is 1 Million in grants from co-financing. Please explore the possibility to use some co-financing funds to cover this position.

2) M&E budget in table B and under section 9 ? M&E is \$82,911 while in the budget table under Annex E is \$63,021.

3) There is difference between the budget table and table B in Portal entry (all 3 components and the M&E differ between \$5,001 up to \$19,890) ? please amend.

04/24/2023: Comment on M&E budget not fully addressed.

Agency responded below ?The M&E budget has been updated throughout the document to \$63,021. The detailed budget annex matches table B for \$63,021?, however, there is still a difference between the amounts listed in Table B and the Budget Table both: \$63,021) vis-?-vis the M&E Budget in Table 7 (\$82,911) ? please amend.

04/27/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

The budget funds personnel to a large extent because the activities are carried out by project staff and associates. We have checked the other TORs for consistency with the budget proposal and updated them accordingly, including adding PMC to the National Project Manager.

The detailed budget annex includes two lines under grants for a total of \$710,532. One line for the ?pre-investment TA reimbursable grants? for \$585,144 and a second line for ?Financial Institutions? grants for \$125,388.

CI will provide financial oversight to IDH as part of our role as the implementing agency. We have provided additional information on the reimbursable grant mechanism in paragraph 167.

IDH Hub is for one pilot country - Colombia. However, as part of the project CI - IDH expects to scope three other countries to understand the potential to replicate the national technical hubs in the future. The scoping missions in 3 countries refer to output 2.1.1. Under component 3 - output 3.1.1 there will also be knowledge product and dissemination events (including workshops) based on the result of scoping studies and recommendations report on feasibility and strategy for replication of TA Hub approach. This is directly related to scoping studies conducted under output 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

4/21/2023

1) Most of the co-financing for the project is in-kind, grant co-financing is \$550K and is already committed to covering personnel salaries and benefits as mentioned in the co-financing letter from IDH and Terms of Reference.

2) The M&E budget has been updated throughout the document to \$63,021. The detailed budget annex matches table B for \$63,021.

3) Table B in the Portal has been updated to match the budget table.

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

03/01/2023: Not fully.

Please provide a breakdown of the budget as per activity mentioned.

04/10/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

Updated Annex XVI (Annex C): PPG Utilization.

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

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: Yes.

04/10/2023: Please see comment on gender below.

04/23/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

03/01/2023: Yes.

04/10/2023: However,

? On Output Target: 1.3.2. At least 10 projects supported under 1.1.2 are assessed in Finance Network member fund investment committee meetings, please ask the Agency to reflect that at least 30%, but preferably, 50% of these projects actively engage women and are gender-responsive.

? Please indicate which women's group/organization or gender experts were consulted as stakeholders (under Stakeholder Engagement section), and will be engaged in project execution.

04/24/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

•

Agency Response

4/21/2023

? At minimum, 30% of the projects will actively engage women and be gender responsive. This is already highlighted in the Gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP), where the project committed to achieving at least 30% of the supported projects to be women-led/owned with potential for gender transformative impact. This has also been added to para 120 (page 8) and RF (page 72) and project description summary. The 30% target was set recognizing the specific context of Colombia for the participation of women in specific sectors of agricultural production. A target of 50% would be unlikely to achieve given that, for example, in Colombia only 23.3% of cocoa farmers are women, compared to 76.7% of men who are engaged in this activity (see page 4 of the GMP) In addition to this, only 26% of individual landholdings are run by women and 36.6% of agricultural production are in the hands of women (page 7 of the GMP).

? During PPG phase, women owned/led SMEs, smallholder group, and stakeholders, for example Asociaci?n de Mujeres Cafeteras de Codazzi (Cesar) and Organizaci?n de mujeres cafeteras de Coocentral (Huila), were consulted. These stakeholders will also be closely engaged during project execution phase. This has been added to para 189 (page 41) and SEP (page 45).

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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: Yes.

04/10/2023: However, please clarify the budget allocated to key KM and communications activities mentioned in Component 3 and in other components as well as the timeline for the implementation of these activities. This can be done by including a simple table in the KM section, listing a budget & timeline for key KM and communications deliverables.

04/24/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response
4/21/2023

A KM budget table has been included in the ProDoc under paragraph 200.

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

03/01/2023: 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

03/01/2023: Yes.

04/10/2023: However, as mention above, there is a discrepancy between M&E budget in table B and under section 9 ? M&E is \$82,911 while in the budget table under Annex E is \$63,021.

04/24/2023: As mentioned above - there is still a \$82,911 figure in table 7 that needs to be corrected.

04/27/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

4/27/2023

Thanks, the figures in Table 7 have been updated.

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

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: Yes. However,

- please refer to comments on the budget and incorporate into the revised agency project document as appropriate.

04/10/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

Updated Annex XVI: PPG Utilization.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: Please address the following:

- Include the mentioned core indicators (CI 3: 3,000 ha; CI 4: 3,000 ha; CI 11: 9,500) in the results framework for consistency.

04/10/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

Core Indicators have been referenced in Results Framework Table in parenthesis after each indicator.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
none received (MSP)

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request none received (MSP)

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
Provided in Annex C: please include breakdown per activity.

04/10/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

3/24/2023

Updated Annex XVI: PPG Utilization.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

03/01/2023: No. Please address comments in this preliminary review. A full review and CEO endorsement decision will be provided upon submission of the outstanding OFP letter of endorsement.

04/10/2023: Please address comments of this joint review. Please include LoE when resubmitting.

04/24/2023: LoE has been submitted. Please address outstanding comment on M&E budget discrepancy.

04/27/2023 Program manager recommends CEO approval.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/1/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/10/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Background: The Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) fund was launched on 12 September 2017 at the UNCCD COP13 in China, with an initial target of \$300 million. It represents the first-of-its-kind investment vehicle leveraging public money to raise private capital for sustainable land management and LDN. The GEF announced at the same COP its support of

\$2 million in grants to the Technical Assistance Facility (TAF) of the fund. The TAF has been successful and supported 15 different project partners for eventual investment.

This GEF-7 global project is funded by \$2 million LDFA set asides and will expand the current work of the TAF with a new focus on locally-initiated and locally owned projects, to enable investment in SMEs, smallholders and communal lands, and also work with selected earlier-stage projects, providing coaching to develop an "investment readiness roadmap" guiding the project/business through the stages towards investment readiness. These projects will range in investment size from approximately USD 100,000 to 2 million. In country/ies to be selected during the project development phase, local business and investment TA providers will be selected and trained to provide these services to the project developers, in other instances this support will be delivered directly through the TAF team.

This new phase of the TAF will offer increased potential for more inclusive and deeper social and environmental impact for locally-initiated projects. Further, more investment will be mobilized in local and regional supply chains to enable sustainable land management and agroforestry investment models and provide offtake and value-add to non-commodity agroforestry produce. Building on the realization that these locally-initiated projects may require more hands-on support/TA, and often also smaller sizes in early stages, this project will pilot the concept of a national LDN TA hub, with local business and investment coaches. This national "TA Hub" will be established in a Colombia, where IDH and its partners have sufficient presence and networks to implement the hub effectively. A letter of endorsement from the OFP in Colombia has been submitted.