



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

Review PIF 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**

WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

4/14/2022

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Not fully.

- As previously discussed: If Table B indicates that the projects intends to work in a "target countries" (see objective) and "one pilot country" (see comp 1), we need a letter of endorsement (LoE). Please clarify if this is forthcoming.

- If it is not forthcoming in time for PIF approval (latest by June 17, 2022), another option is to rephrase Table B and the text in the PIF in a way that shows that a pilot country will be selected during PPG stage out of the proposed pool (which is indicated in the geographic section). However, the provision of the LoE at CEO endorsement stage would be a requirement for CEO endorsement.

- Output: 1.3.2: the formulation is not really an output. What is the purpose of these ?40 discussions and exchanges?? Please, clarify.

04/22/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

04/22/22

Pilot country/ies will be selected early in PPG stage. Table B (output 1.1.1) and PIF text have been revised to reflect this. Well noted that LoE(s) will be required for CEO Endorsement package submission. Output 1.3.2 has been re-formulated.

#### **Co-financing**

**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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Not fully.

- An effort to increase the level of cofinancing, at least during the PPG, should be made/indicated.

04/22/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

### Agency Response

04/22/22

This has been indicated beneath the co-financing table C, as well as an indication that overall project co-financing will potentially increase during project implementation as SMEs, project developers and investors are selected and engage with the national TA Hub process.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response  
**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**6. Are the project?/program?s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project?/program?s intended location?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Only need to indicate that the project has a regional/global nature as of now.

In fact, the list of countries here is not needed here. You may consider including it in the text to make clear the project's approach that it will select a pilot country out of this pool.

04/22/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

04/22/22

List of countries removed from this section and added to alternative scenario section (outcome 1.1) text to clarify that selection of pilot country/ies will be done during PPG stage.

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**



**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: As discussed above - please refer to comments made in box 2 on Table B.

If option 2 is selected, please indicate here so that we have a clear understanding about the requirement for an LoE latest at CEO endorsement stage.

04/22/2022: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response 04/22/22

Option 2 is selected, and LoE(s) will be provided with CEO Endorsement submission package.

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/19/2022: No. Please address comments and clarification questions.

04/22/2022: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO PIF approval.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

04/22/2022: After the pilot country(-ies) is/are selected during the PPG stage in a consultative process with stakeholders, please provide a Letter of Endorsement (LoE) from the GEF OFP. Note that the LoE will be pre-condition for final CEO endorsement/approval.

### **Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/19/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/22/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

### **PIF Recommendation to CEO**

### **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

Background: The LDN fund was launched on 12 September 2017 at the COP13 to the UNCCD in Ordos, 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 \$2.00 million in grants to the Technical Assistance Facility (TAF) of the fund. The TAF has been successful and contracted 15 different project partners for eventual investment.

This global project will expand the current work of the TAF with a new focus on locally-initiated and owned projects, to enable investment in SMEs, smallholders and community land, 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 100k to 2 million. In a 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.

The reason for this proposed new focus of the TAF is that locally-initiated private projects can offer greater potential for more inclusive and deeper social and environmental impact, and also that more investment is needed 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 selected pilot country (to be selected during PPG phase) where IDH and its partners have sufficient presence and networks to implement the hub effectively. The long list of countries being considered for selection as the pilot country, and for subsequent national TA hub scoping studies (see output 2.1.1) include Cameroon, Ethiopia, Ghana, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Tanzania and Uganda. Colombia and Viet Nam will also be considered due to IDH's strong presence and network in these countries.

Note: While the nature of the project is global, for the pilot country that will be selected, a Letter of Endorsement from the GEF OFP will be a required at CEO approval (at endorsement stage).

With regard to COVID-19, activities to be conducted during PPG stage will not be affected, and are mostly virtual. A more details COVID-19 adaptation strategy will be provided at CEO endorsement stage, as appropriate.