

Ecosystem Restoration

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11118

Countries

Global (Angola, Brazil, Cambodia, Chad, Congo DR, Cote d'Ivoire, Haiti, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique, Nepal, Peru, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam)

Project Name

Ecosystem Restoration

Agencies

CI, UNDP, World Bank, FAO, IUCN, UNEP, IFAD

Date received by PM

4/11/2023

Review completed by PM

5/4/2023

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully. The program information table in Part I is not fully completed.

- Please include a list of executing agencies as far as possible and in line with submitted child project concepts.

- Please enter the Program Commitment Deadline.

- Please expand the taxonomy. There are numerous additional key words that the IP should be tagged to, e.g. LDN, nature-based solutions, innovations, IPLCS, indigenous knowledge, climate change mitigation, mangroves, etc. etc. etc.

05/04/2023:

- The taxonomy is still truncated as previously. Please try again to expand as appropriate. Let the PM know if there is a technical issue.

05/15/2023: Has been adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

Taxonomy expanded

05/01/2023:

Executing agencies from the child projects have been included

Program Commitment Deadline included

Taxonomy expanded

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

- Please change the marker category from "significant" to "principal", given the IP's focus on restoration.

05/04/2023: Not fully.

My suggestion was to also change the Desertification Marker from "significant" to "principal", given the IP's focus on restoration.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

Desertification marker updated

05/01/2023:

Markers updated

2. Program Summary

a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

In this section, please add the following information in a concise way: (i) program objective, (ii) how the program will address transformative change (i.e. as stated in para 6 of the GCP

concept note), (iii) more explicit information about the geographic coverage of the program (i.e. as stated in para 7 of the GCP concept note), (iv) the GEB targets and beneficiaries as per CI table, (v) small version of the map.

Other general comments on the PFD:

- Some parts of the text that was presented for upstream review is missing in the portal. Please see throughout the review sheet prompts to include the missing information.

- Several citations of scientific papers and other documents are missing, and a few key papers, e.g. as presented / discussed during the PFD design workshop, still need to be incorporated and cited to improve the scientific underpinning of the program.

- When re-submitting, please check one more time for consistency between the PFD and the GCP concept note. There is essential information in the GCP concept note that has relevance for the program and could serve to better explain the programmatic approach (as it is the main vehicle to bring the programmatic approach about). Please note that we cannot expect the reader to refer to the GCP concept note, as this is only an Annex of the PFD. Therefore, the essential information contained in the GCP concept note should be incorporated into the main PFD text (and/or with references to the GCP).

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Please remove yellow highlights and re-submit the final version without yellow highlights.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

Yellow highlights removed

05/01/2023:

- The text in the executive summary has been amended incorporating text from the GCP as suggested. The targets have been adjusted for consistency with Core indicators Table

- A map showing the IP child countries and their location in globally restoration priority areas has been included.
- There was an issue with the portal on the April 12 submission. All text should be included now.
- Citations now included
- Consistency between the PFD, GCP child project checked.

3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) **Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) **Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?**
- d) **Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) **Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

a) Yes.

b) Components, outcomes & indicators:

Component 1:

- It's not clear how the two outcomes and indicators are responding to the aspect of this component referring to incentives. Please clarify or include.

- In addition, what is meant by structures?

- Please clarify what specifically the following indicator will measure: 1.1.3. number of policies in 20 countries targeted for high risk of negative spillover effects on targeted ecosystem restoration projects.

- The multi-stakeholder/participatory aspects are not demonstrated strongly in Component 1. We imagine this is key for facilitating policy coherence.

Component 2:

- The indicators targets must be consistent with the Core Indicator table targets, please revise. Also, the main targets should all appear in the indicative program overview.

Component 3:

- Outcome 3.1 refers to increased capacity ? who is the target group? Is it government, private sector? The indicators refer to the private sector, but do they need the capacity to leverage resources?

- Indicator 3.1.1 Decline in financing gap as defined by financing plans developed for restoration geographies, ecosystems, and/or models. Question: Can decline in financing be measured by financing plans? If not, please consider an alternative measure of success related to the interventions that will be carried out.

Indicator 3.1.3: # of knowledge products used by private sector actors to catalyze, de-risk, and increase return on investment in restoration. Question: What other activities will be targeted and measured to unlock or enable private sector investment? This indicator is only looking at knowledge products.

Indicator 3.2.2: How is ?benefit? being defined here? ? income, knowledge, jobs, increased finance for community projects?

Under Outcome 3.2: a better measure for inclusiveness would be to have a target percentage of stakeholders ? women, IPLCs, youth, out of total target beneficiaries. So indicator 3.2.2 could read: At least 50% of total beneficiaries from the program? are women, youth and IPLCs.

Component 4:

- The title of the component does not speak to the need to influence beyond the confines of the program.

- Outcome 4.1, Indicator 4.1.3 could specify the percentage of women, youth, IPLCs in the child project steering committees and program boards (and target no less than 30 percent women).

- Overall, the indicators are far too granular for program level outcomes. What indicator will measure the influence the program is seeking to have at the sub-regional level among the countries or at global level? Will it consider countries that are not in the program?

05/04/2023: All previous comments cleared, except this one:

- On Outcome 3.1: Please explain, who is considered a ?restoration practitioner? as this term is used in various ways (include a footnote or in brackets) in the table.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

Definition of restoration practitioners included in the PFD: Restoration practitioners are actors engaged in the practice of restoration with a connection to direct restoration work and projects being implemented on the ground.

05/01/2023:

(b)

Component 1:

- Component 1 edited to clarify ?structures? and to strengthen the linkage between multi-stakeholder participation and policy coherence.
- Outcome 1.1 was edited to include ?multi-stakeholder dialogue?
- Indicator 1.1.3. was edited to clarify the effect of the outcome on barriers, perverse incentives, and private sector participation.
- Outcome 1.2 was edited to highlight the multi-stakeholder dimension and private sector participation.
- The objective level targets have been clarified with the correct targets in the indicative program overview.

Component 2:

- The indicators 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 in component 2 have been adjusted for consistency with GEF core sub-indicator: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.3, 4.4
- Indicator 2.2.3 have been segmented to specify the number of IPLC, number of male & female (CI 11), number of youth.

Component 3:

- Outcome 3.1: The target group has been better identified as ?Restoration Practitioners.? This group requires capacity building to realize its plans.

- Indicator 3.1.1. has been edited to better identify the restoration practitioners by targeted groups for capacity building in financing capacity, multi-stakeholder organization and alignment to decrease the financing gap.

- Indicator 3.1.1. The indicator is not focused on the decline in financing. It measures the decline in the financing gap, which demonstrates that the target groups were able to calculate the costs of financing plans, leverage resources, and properly channel or commit resources to the restoration plans. This indicator goes to the highest result level in the chain of accomplishment. A decline in the financing gap for key restoration activities, as defined by financing plans nested within restoration plans developed for restoration geographies, ecosystems, and/or models. This will signal that the capacity to generate resources to support ecosystem restoration has been realized.

- Indicator 3.1.3. has been amended to include more information. This is, however, an indicator and not a description of the outputs contributing to the Outcome 3.1. Rather, a measuring point established to indicate if and to what degree the outcome is achieved

- Indicator 3.2.2 has been modified to read, ?Number and types of stakeholders surveyed expressing benefits from program induced investments in the restoration continuum through enhanced efficiency, effectiveness, and livelihood benefits /or financing for restoration activities. Specific benefit baseline and targets will be determined during PPGs phases. The program will aggregate the suite of benefits from diverse restoration schemes seeking in the M&E baseline common benefits across all restoration and per restoration category, benefits tailored to the country and restoration type.

- The suggestion is well noted. The target will be established with input from the child PPG phases. During that dialogue, specific targets for women, youth, etc. can be established through dialogue and with guidance of the GCP. A 50% gender benefitting target will be promoted as a desirable situation.

Component 4:

- The component was edited to include the phrase, ?and transformational growth in Global Environmental Benefits.? The rationale is to enable the Program board and GCP to focus on growth. Adding projects for example, is one potential avenue to growing environmental benefits. It will also guide the decision to add (or not) additional projects. Growth could also include increased efficiency or scaling is existing projects as well.

- On ?granularity.? The number and types of indicators supports Program level evaluations and provides future evaluators and board members of snapshots of expectations from the design stage. It also provides benchmarks to future GCP project managers and PSC members sufficient guidance ensure the GCP is having its expected program-level impact.

- On granularity, the expansive influence of the program and the need to influence beyond its confines, 4.3, particularly its indicators 4.3.1., 4.3.2, 4.3.3 and 4.3.5 , are indicators

that measure the larger transformational change this program seeks to have beyond the stakeholders of the projects themselves with the larger group of restoration stakeholders around the world, through the knowledge platform, communities of practice and diverse tools and knowledge products, and dialogues generated.

- To reduce ?granularity? 4.1.2. was modified to ?Number and type of actions taken to increase and expand GEBs beyond the scope of the project? This is intended to focus the board on expanding the program and its benefits. The text has been amended to include a Program Expansion Plan that could include scaling in existing countries and scaling to new countries, increase in efficiency through global learning, etc. See Par. 90.

- Indicator 4.2.2. was replaced with the ?Number and types of stakeholders benefiting from program induced investments in the restoration continuum through enhanced efficiency improvements, effectiveness or financing in restoration activities.? The focus on growth speaks to the component.

- Indicator 4.3.5. was changed to ?# of knowledge products, prioritization tools, and multisectoral conversations used by private sector actors....? to better focus on the private sector participation as an engine of growth in GEB expansion.

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?

b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

- The narrative is missing more detailed description of drivers of ecosystem degradation, the barriers the program will address and why this programmatic approach is a suitable means of addressing these drives and barriers - in other words: what is the added value of the program. (We note that the text on barriers that was presented for upstream review is missing in this section. Please include as appropriate, also considering upstream comments on the text).

- Please to introduce nuances in terms of differences or common challenges among the 20 target countries. This should be done within box 2 or as a complementary text explaining box 2.

- Citations are missing (e.g. Pimentel et al., Edwards, et al.). Citation for para 13 is lacking. Add citation for "documented" (para 2). Add citation for paper mentioned by STAP: <https://rdcu.be/c8RGQ> on links between migration and drought in Africa.

- Para 4 and 11 address the same topic. Consider merging.

- Para 5: Add "and negative effects on livelihoods" to the heading "Social and Political Instability".

- Add one para on the value proposition for GEF investing in global restoration efforts (refer to GEF-8 Programming Directions text), with a short statement on how the program builds on previous, albeit more fragmented efforts of GEF). It should become clear that the program is striving to elevate restoration to the next level in terms of focus on transformative impact and scale, and in support of the global commitments made.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- Par. 2 was amended to incorporate the drivers from the GCP. The text is also rectified with the barriers presented in paragraph 13 to 17. Note that the barrier presentation does not immediately follow the presentation of the drivers.

- Complementary text has been added to paragraph 12 and within box 2 highlighting differences and common challenges..

- Citations previously omitted are now included in the document.

- Paragraph 4 was merged with paragraph 11. They are now marked as paragraph 10.

- On missing citations: All citations are presented in this version.

- Par. 4 (formerly 5), subtitle amended to "Social and Political Instability and Negative Effects on Livelihoods".

- Par 26 is amended to include a statement on the Program value proposition

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully adequate.

- ToC: Please include a description of the entire ToC. The ToC statement at the end is very useful, but it would be better placed in context with / referring to the ToC diagram. Please also elaborate on gender within this ToC statement.

- Further, please consider including socio-cultural dimensions and behavior changes in the causal pathways and development assumptions. Please refer to Principle 7 on Ecosystem restoration (UN Decade). Restoration in particular has a cultural dimension and would be important to consider in indigenous-led restoration approaches and in incorporating Indigenous and traditional Knowledge (ITK) into the program's restoration strategies and approaches.

- The drivers outlined in the ToC seem to actually be barriers instead and have been repeated in the barriers section of the ToC. please clarify.

- The transformation lever Multi-stakeholder dialogue could also be applied to Component 1 and Innovation and in particular Learning could also be applied to Component 4. Please elaborate on IPLC and CSO involvement in this context.

- Other missing elements/sections not addressed adequately: (i) a description of the transformation levers, (ii) description of the components of the program so that the reader has a sense of what the program will actually be doing; (iii) incremental reasoning, (iv) the role of key stakeholders, including the private sector. With this the narrative around how the program is addressing policy coherence, transformation, and scale will come out more strongly.

05/04/2023: Previous comments are mostly cleared, however, please note:

- The drivers mentioned in the TOC diagram are not fully consistent with the drivers that are mentioned in the Program Outline, e.g. paragraph. Please consider to make this more consistent.

- Editorial comment: The text in the barriers arrow on red background is very difficult to read, consider another color?

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

- The drivers in the ToC updated to reflect the text in description
- Red background removed. Image should be easier to review

05/01/2023:

The description of the entire TOC is presented in the following segments:

The Drivers are presented in par. 2.

Benefits presented in para 3

The consequences or the impacts of ecosystem degradation are presented in par.4

The Global Response needed is presented in para 5

The Barriers hindering the global response are presented in paras 12-16. These include Culture and Gender-related barriers. Drivers are mentioned in the barriers section to assist the reader in linking drivers and barriers to help the reader establish the linkage. Text has been moved from this section to eliminate the overlap.

The Summary TOC is presented in para 22 and 23. The TOC diagram has been modified to eliminate the overlap. The TOC diagram has been amended.

On multistakeholder dialogue, par 38 states, "The Program will support Child Projects with technical assistance, tools, and support to targeted communications, effective multi-stakeholder policy dialogue for the inclusion of public and private sector participation and integration of women, local communities and indigenous populations. Knowledge of impacts of policies and restoration impacts on vulnerable populations will also be exchanged through working groups, Communities of Practice and knowledge exchange and best practices through the Program's Platform." An additional statement, "Knowledge exchange includes cross/cutting areas such as multi-stakeholder dialogue, Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) and gender perspectives" has been added.

Please note that the missing elements were due to a problem in loading the document in the GEF Portal. The full sections are now available addressing issues (i) to (iv).

See para 70 as part of Outcome 4.3 on IPLC and CSO involvement in multistakeholder dialogue and learning contexts.

Outcome 1.1. has been amended to include multi-stakeholder dialogue:

National and sub-national policies and regulatory frameworks are harmonized through multistakeholder dialogue for improved policy coherence and enhanced implementation capacity enabling ecosystem restoration:

The text: "Successful ecosystem restoration is based not only on ecological considerations, but also on socio-cultural factors that are important for achieving long-term sustainability." Has been added to the Multi-Dialogue pathway.

The following missing sections were in the original version.

(i) a description of the transformation levers, - See para 19: reference on the source GEF-8 Strategic Positioning Framework, pp 27., figure No. 1 Levers for Systems Transformation were added; levers described by GEF/STAP nomenclature

(ii) description of the components of the program so that the reader has a sense of what the program will actually be doing; - See para 24 to 71

(iii) incremental reasoning is developed throughout the section. In response to the observation, a summary Incremental argument has been added in para 24

(iv) the role of key stakeholders, including the private sector. See Outcome 1.2 Para 36-40, 46, 53, and para 72 has been added to complement description of stakeholder role.

With this the narrative around how the program is addressing policy coherence, transformation, and scale will come out more strongly.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not adequately described.

- The entire component description is missing. It was presented in the upstream draft on pages 16 - 25. Please include, taking upstream comments on the text into account.

05/04/2023: Has been included.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- Component description included

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully adequate.

- An organization chart/visual depiction showing how the program will be coordinated with relevant partners, and with the child projects and coordination around the platform would be useful here.

- Please include a summary on what the other Agencies will each bring to the table (such as KM platforms, experience with finance, policy, innovation etc.) or how they will be involved. This would expand the reach of the program beyond the CI offerings. This is in reference to the text on paras 82 - 90, especially para 85: "To support policy innovations, the Technical Advisory Committee and the Restoration Platform brings to the table key national stakeholders with policy responsibility, such as ministry focal points, and creates an interactive space with IA experts from CI, WB, IFAD, IUCN and UN Agencies with examples of policy achievements that favor restoration and livelihoods."

- "To assure that the Program impacts above the sum of its Child Project results, the Program Board and Steering Committee, will link their high-level ministerial connections to global ecosystem development movements" - Is this in reference to the UN Decade on Restoration? There is an opportunity in this section to expand on how the program will support this movement and potential ideas for linkages.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- A Governance Structure chart has been included in Paragraph 83, with a brief description of each tier purpose.

- Paragraph 85. Included example of UNDP support on policies, and the World Resources Institute (WRI) support in capacity building. Paragraph 86 information on EcoAg Partners, 1000L, and UNEP possible support was included. Also, Box 4. Potential Partners Organization with a list and brief description/competencies of each organization has been included. Organigram and description of potential partner competencies added to clarify this

- Text of paragraph 91 modified to reflect changes, and text added on connections to potential partner organizations

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

e) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

- Core indicators: the numbers are reasonable (we understand they are aggregated based on Child project concept notes). Please use those numbers consistently throughout the PFD (e.g. in indicative summary table).

o Indicator 1.2 Please list the Name of the PAs, WDPA ID, IUCN Category of the PAs covered, as available.

o Core Indicator 3 on restoration indicates an overall target of 2.23 million hectares of land under restoration whereas the Program Indicative Overview notes "number of hectares of land under restoration (Target 4.3M ha)". Please adjust where appropriate to ensure internal consistency in the numbers presented.

o Indicator 4.2, kindly refer to any Third Party Certification planned to be covered, as available.

o Indicator 4.4 please upload documents that justify HCVF status, as available.

o Indicator 4.5 Please ensure the full extent of OECMs planned to be covered by the Program are listed. OECMs do not aggregate up to the main Core Indicator 4. This means the same area listed under sub-indicator 4.1 can also be marked as an OECM under 4.5. In addition, please indicate any other information as available: Name, WDPA ID.

- The text in paragraphs 73 - 81 would benefit from some elaboration and additional information, such as:

o Para 75: This requires more details on the aggregation of targets/results. What M&E will be done at program level? How is this linked to the indicators mentioned in the Program Overview (indicative summary table)?

o Para 79: will the joint M&E framework be part of the GCP design?

o Please add one paragraph on other benefits, e.g. socio-economic benefits, and explain if they will be measured at program level and/or child project level.

05/04/2023: Clarification question and ADDITIONAL correction requests on core indicator 6:

-- Paragraph 104 indicates "the program aims to restore 2.25M ha of land?", whereas other references in the document (paragraph 106 and Core Indicator data entry) indicate 2.23m. Please update where relevant for internal consistency.

- It noted that: Paragraph 106 indicates "10.5M ha of landscapes under improved management?" whereas the Core Indicator entry indicates 10.6m. Please adjust either for internal consistency.

- the program overview mentions "1 shared water ecosystem...." as a GEB, however, the core indicator table doesn't seem to include this number, please make this consistent.

- Core indicator 6: While the total target for the program with about 190 million tCO₂e is considered reasonable, the individual carbon calculations at child project level have some huge outliers, which need to be double checked:

(i) Madagascar, with 94.5 Mt CO₂e (half of the total of the entire program; the target translates into \$0.2 GEF grant/tCO₂e, which is far below our historical average of >\$1/tCO₂e);

(ii) South Africa, with 90.0 Mt CO₂e (the figure is wrongly reported under CI 6.2 ("outside AFOLU")); further it translates into \$0.1 GEF grant / tCO₂e, which is unrealistic in our view.

(iii) Mexico, Rwanda and Chad targets are very low, translating into \$24 - \$33 GEF grant/tCO₂e, which is rather expensive.

(iv) Peru: 3.2 Mt CO₂e reported in the Concept note but apparently not included in the Portal table.

Please double check those figures and adjust in the PFD text and Core indicator table as appropriate.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed & GHG mitigation targets have been revised.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

-- The value in paragraph 104 has been updated and the rest of the document has been checked.

- The value in paragraph 106 has been updated and the rest of the document has been checked.

- On Core Indicator 7, the Core Indicator table has been updated in the portal to align with the program overview that mentioned "1 shared water ecosystem...." as a GEB

- On Core indicator 6:

(i) Madagascar - the target was recomputed and reported in the country child project portal and revised the PFD figures

(ii) South Africa - the target was recomputed and was reported under CI 6.1 with 18 Mt CO2e in the country child project portal and revised the PFD figures

(iii) Mexico - From the EOI stage, the team adjusted the assumptions of the calculations and are proposing an increase of 68% from the original proposal to 3.2 MtCO2e based on a twenty-year project lifespan. The team will develop more detailed calculations during the PPG phase.

(iv) Rwanda - the target was recomputed and reported in the country child project portal and revised the PFD figures

(v) Chad - The child project team took note of this feedback and that during the PPG phase, the figures will be reviewed and that the FAO EX-ACT tool will be used to calculate the mitigation potential.

(vi) Peru: the core indicators table at the country child project level has been updated to reflect all targets

05/01/2023:

- We have carefully checked the numbers in the entire document and established consistency.

- At the PFD level, the details requested are now reflected in the portal. Please note that the PFD template only allows the aggregated value at the level of Core Indicator 1.

- Core Indicator 3 and Core Indicator 4 have been corrected based on the country child project targets. The Indicative Program Overview table has been updated.

- In the case of Mali, this will be one of the project targets and the procurement of the third-party firm will be done during the PPG phase. UNDP Mali and CI will work together for this.

- Mali, Peru, and Uzbekistan identified HVCF as a project site. The documentation will be secured at the PIF/PPG phase.

- We note that no country submitted a target for sub-indicator 4.5. No OECM and WDPA ID is available. Further, 13 countries submitted target on sub-indicator 4.1. If the total area (i.e. no area identified by countries but rather total hectare within a country) identified under sub-indicator 4.1 will be listed as an OECM under 4.5, this may be a double counting of targets and the information per OECM site will need to be identified by the countries.

- Para 75 was amended to include the following text: At Program Level, M&E will provide both a conceptual basis for monitoring and evaluating the progress and performance of the ERIPI, as well as a set of common processes, tools, and key learning questions to facilitate harmonized tracking and reporting of results and capture of relevant and useful information during implementation of the Program. Specifically, the M&E framework will: Facilitate programmatic learning and adaptive management of ERIP child projects; Meet programmatic accountability, learning and communication needs; Provide an evidence-based account of the program-wide achievements of ERIP; and Contribute to the development of new programmatic interventions.

- Para 79 explains that the M&E Framework is part of the GCP design and why.

- Para 80 indicates that the Program Results Framework is the tool to track progress at the Program level and it will be reported by all child projects in their annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) to the GEF.

- Para 81 and 82 have been amended to inform that the Global M&E unit will develop a guide and tools to inform child projects on the indicators and GEBs for tracking and reporting to the Global Child Project.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Minor adjustments necessary.

- ESS: please include FPIC as a mitigation strategy
- Macro-economic risk: Consider adding other commodities besides gold, which are driving deforestation and mining.
- Governance: please include tenure as an element of risk and define a suitable mitigation strategy (consider promoting the VGGT).
- We agree with the overall rating of substantial, however we disagree that this is due to the "complexity" of the program. On the contrary, the programmatic approach is supposed to mitigate the risk of having 20 countries all going their own way on restoration. Please rephrase.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- (?...mitigation measures, including adherence to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) process...) to reflect this request has been added to paragraphs 98 and 146 of the PFD. FPIC will be part of the Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP) for projects that trigger the IP MS, and the IPP will be developed during the PPG phase.
- Macro-economic risk amended to including commodities such as palm oil, soybean, others: Economic downturns could pose a risk to ecosystem restoration programs, as governments and companies may prioritize other expenditures, leading to reduced investment. To mitigate this risk, alternative financing mechanisms such as public-private partnerships can be explored. For example, changes in global market demand, consumer preferences, and government policies can impact the viability of restoration efforts in palm oil and soy producing regions. Similarly, a decline in oil and gas prices can reduce funding for ecosystem restoration initiatives, as governments and companies that rely on these commodities face reduced revenues. In addition, the demand for minerals is driven by various macro-economic factors, and any shifts in these factors can impact the viability of ecosystem restoration efforts in mining regions.
- Governance risk: has been amended to include tenure as an element of risk and provide several mitigation strategies, including promoting the VGGT.
- The overall rating of substantial justification has been amended considering the high and substantial-risks factors in categories that are crucial for the success of the program, such as climate, governance, capacity, and stakeholder engagement.

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

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

- The alignment and potential synergy with other GEF-8 IPs such as Food Systems, Critical Forest Biomes, Blue & Green Islands, NZNPA, etc. is missing. Please include (i.e. refer to GEF-8 Programming Directions text as a basis and customize).

- Much of the text in paragraphs 109 - 113 would be useful in the program description section. Please consider moving parts of this text to earlier sections as appropriate.

- The table in para 113 could be separated by hard restoration actions and soft/enabling environment type actions. Further,

o only one country is mentioned under cross-sectoral policy instruments, isn't this something we would want to have in all to encourage the work around policy coherence?

o Can PES be considered as an innovative financial mechanism?

o It may create misunderstandings if only 2 countries (Nepal, Cambodia) are listed as examples for "globally important biodiversity". This seems not to reflect what was presented in the EOI concepts and is also not in line with para 103 - 107, which explain the alignment with the GBF targets. Please add more countries or consider making the category more specific.

05/04/2023: Addressed. However, please correct one typo: "Uzbek"

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

- "Uzbek" has been corrected to "Uzbekistan" in the table under paragraph 114

05/01/2023:

The alignment and potential synergy with other GEF-8 IPs such as Food Systems, Critical Forest Biomes, Blue & Green Islands, NZNPA, etc. have been included.

- Excerpts of the text have been included in the Program Description and 109 to 113 edited.
- Table in para 113 has been amended based on updated distributions and categories that better align with the GEF programmatic directions (on systems), on the communities of practice (resilience, etc).
- Cross-sector policy instruments removed as a separate row since this is noted in all child projects
- Updated: Mechanisms row specified as non-PES
- Added other countries to the biodiversity cluster and reorganized this table to more accurately represent the IP.

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Text missing.

- Please include the text on child project selection criteria and process, which was presented in the upstream draft, taking into account comments made at that time.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- Child project selection criteria included

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Yes. However, please consider:

- Adding specific country examples in paragraphs 103 - 107, where those component activities were specifically mentioned in the child project concepts notes or will be focused on.

- Editorial note: Paragraph 105: it lumps area under restoration and area under improved management into a total figure, this may confuse the reader.

05/04/2023: Addressed. One important editorial comment:

Please refer to the GBF as the "Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework" in the PFD.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

References to GBF updated in PFD.

05/01/2023:

Recommendations well noted. Component activities from country concepts have been included in paragraphs 103-107 as examples of child projects coherence and alignment with PFD.

Area has been disaggregated to show land under restoration (CI 3) and landscapes under improved practices (CI 4): 2.23M ha of land under restoration (CI 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4) and 10.5M ha of landscapes under improved management practices (CI 4.1 and 4.3)

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

Text missing in the respective sections:

- Please include text on gender, which was presented in the upstream draft, taking into account comments made at that time.

- Please include text on stakeholder engagement, which was presented in the upstream draft, taking into account comments made at that time. Further, reconsider "No" for IPLC consultations. Has none of the child project concepts done any consultations as part of their conceptualization? If "No" is indeed the response, please explain why and when it will be done.

- There is no narrative on how the private sector will be incorporated in the project. Please include the text that was presented in the upstream draft, taking into account comments made at that time. Private sector engagement also needs to be elaborated on throughout the program description in earlier sections.

- Please include all text from the separate file "Gender, Stakeholder Engagement, and Private Sector" into the respective sections of the portal template (separate files will not be circulated to STAP and GEF Council).

- Further on gender: As the MEAs are prominently mentioned in the document, please make references to the fact that the MEAs, especially the Rio Conventions all have gender action plans with specific activities relating to enhancing the reflection of gender equality in NBSAPs, NDCs, LDN reporting among others. Most recently, the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework adopted at COP 15 included two gender-specific targets ? Target 22 and Target 23.

- Please also note the comments made on gender aggregated indicators in box 3 (on the program summary overview table).

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- text on gender, stakeholder engagement, private sector included in the portal.

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Clarification question.

- The risk category "Medium/Moderate" in this section appears to be different than the overall category in the risk section, where it was "Substantial"?

05/04/2023: Has been clarified.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

- The safeguards rating of medium/moderate is different than the overall risk rating for the program. The risk section has been revised.

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

- While confirmed with "yes" in this section, the KM strategy needs to be better described in the program description. We note that the GCP concept note states: "Knowledge generation, exchange, and learning is a pillar of the transformational process. The Child Project will develop a comprehensive Knowledge Generation Strategy during PPG that will optimize the connections between many networks rallied around many ecosystems, such as mangroves, grasslands, etc. Expanding the relationships and connecting successful practices to successful financing is at the core of the model." This should be included into the PFD and further elaborated on.

- The PFD includes KM & Learning deliverables associated with capacity building, knowledge sharing and learning across child projects, including workshops, and knowledge products. However, there is no reference to a communications strategy/plan for the Program. Component 4 includes only one word (communication) in the context of M&E and offers no details. There is no mention of dissemination at all. Thus, the agency is requested to include a brief description of plans to prepare/implement a coherent overall communications strategy for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects. This should also be properly budgeted into the Program.

- Please include the text on Knowledge Management from the separate file "Gender, Stakeholder Engagement, and Private Sector" into the portal template (separate files will not be circulated to STAP and GEF Council).

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

Knowledge generation, exchange, and learning is a pillar of the transformational process. The causal pathway between knowledge generation, exchange, and learning leading to positive behavioral change leads to the assumption that there are already successful practices and approaches that can be identified and adopted through knowledge sharing and replication.

Has been added under pathways and assumptions in the Theory of Change section.

Added to Para 57. (Component 4) Knowledge generation and exchange will collate from numerous existing sources, such as COICA (Coordinadora de las Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica) and Cis Indigenous Support Programs amongst other UN Decade, IA and EA programs and working groups that promote uptake by decision makers and the capacity building needed to mainstream restoration guidance. The Program will build on the science communications capacity of existing restoration networks such as the Global Restoration Observatory (GRO), UN Decade and others, to disseminate tools, methodologies, and other practitioner-facing project outputs, while resourcing the process of consolidating this guidance so that its authors are in proactive communication with one another.

Added to Para 67: The Global Child Project (GCP) aims to optimize connections between networks rallied around various ecosystems, such as mangroves and grasslands, and connect successful practices to successful financing. To achieve this goal, the project will develop a comprehensive Knowledge Generation Strategy. The strategy will include identifying key stakeholders, mapping existing knowledge, identifying knowledge gaps, sharing knowledge among stakeholders, building capacity, identifying successful practices, identifying financing mechanisms, and monitoring and evaluating the impact of knowledge generation activities on ecosystem health and socio-economic well-being. By implementing this strategy, the project hopes to achieve positive transformational change in the targeted ecosystems

As part of the Outcome 4.2: M&E, reporting, communications, and coordination support effective and adaptive program management, the following text has been added to describe plans to prepare/implement a communications strategy & outreach: The communications strategy aims to build and maintain political will for achieving forest and landscape restoration at scale through a global awareness raising campaign. This campaign will include national components and high-profile events targeted at decision-makers. The strategy also includes the development of outreach and communications tools, such as field visits for journalists and timely media products. Knowledge sharing will be reinforced through various initiatives and platforms, and regional initiatives. The main stakeholder engagement mechanism will be an Ecosystem Restoration hub or platform that connects Child Project

participants with Program-level dialogue, training, communications, and tools, and involves stakeholders in networking events at the global, regional, and national levels. Overall, the strategy focuses on raising awareness, engaging stakeholders, and influencing policy to achieve the required transformational changes for successful forest and landscape restoration at scale.

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) 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):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Changes are required in the following five child projects:

- #11132 Cote d'Ivoire, #11121 Mexico, #11126 Nepal, #11134 Rwanda, #11131 Viet Nam:

Please change the GEF financing table and PPG table so that country STAR allocation by BD, CC, and LD match with Sources of funds table. (Reviewer will provide the correct data from the LoEs in a separate email)

Please also remove the cents (decimals) and round the figures down ? otherwise, the submission may not go through the validation.

NOTE: To ensure smooth validation, please ensure rounding down, e.g. \$26,999.99 should be rounded to \$26,999.

NOTE: The rounding is not necessary in the child project templates that are annexed to the PIF.

05/04/2023: Not fully addressed.

- there are still differences between Sources of funds table and Uses of funds (from financing table and PPG table combined) for Congo DR, Mexico and Nepal (see separate email).

- LOE from Mexico still reflect Uses of funds above, not Sources of funds as entered in Portal.

- LOE from Viet Nam reflect different Sources of funds from Portal.

Please correct.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed. All LoEs are uploaded.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

-The differences have been closed. (1) For Congo DR, the 4\$ variance under CC has been addressed (2) For Mexico, the \$3.1M variance between BD and CC has been addressed (3) For Nepal, the \$1 variance between BD and CC has been addressed

-The signed revised LOE from Mexico now reflects the Sources of Funds in the portal

-The signed revised LOE from Viet Nam now reflects the Sources of Funds in the portal

- The new LOE for Brazil signed by the newly-appointed GEF OFP has been uploaded in the portal

05/01/2023:

1. Upon checking and portal validation, countries that need revised LOE due to changes in STAR allocation and Sources of Funds Table are , #11121 Mexico, #11131 Viet Nam, and #11138 Chad

In the case of #11132 Cote d'Ivoire, the STAR allocation indicated in the signed LOE is correct. The portal entries for BD and LD in the Sources of Funds table had been inadvertently interchanged. We already corrected the portal entries and were able to validate, hence, there is no need to secure a revised LOE.

In the case of #11124 Brazil, the OFP changed within the PFD submission, thus a new LOE is needed.

In the case of #11134 Rwanda, the country and IA confirmed that the BD and LD STAR allocation are now sufficient and the signed LOE will be retained while there is a minor reduction in the portal entry. Hence, there is no need for a new LOE.

In the case of #11126 Nepal, the allocations are aligned between the portal and LOE. Hence, there is no need for a new LOE.

2. The cents/decimals have been removed and the figures are rounded down. We were also able to validate. CI also updated the child project concepts to ensure consistency.

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Please see comment on STAR above.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Please see comment above.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Please see comment above.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?

c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?

d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?

e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?

f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?

g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Changes are required.

In a separate email, the reviewer will provide an Excel file with the information we found in the Letters of Endorsement (LoEs) vis-?-vis the information entered in the Portal. In red color you will find the fields that are inconsistent. As you know, figures in the Portal can be lower than those in LoE, so there is no need to do anything on these ? but it can't be higher (some cases are higher by cents ? this needs to be amended because the total Agency Fee is higher by 2 dollars or so). Some fields are easier to be changed in Portal (i.e. Title or Executing Entity). However, the financial information needs to be carefully reviewed considering the guidance provided by the IP Coordination Team as well as the figures that allow the submission to go through validation? this means that in consistency with what it is presented on Point 1 on the financial information, the LoEs need to reflect those figures that allowed the submission included in the Sources of Funding.

Please also remove the cents and round the figures down ? otherwise, the submission may not go through the validation.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

For countries with this issue, the cents have been rounded down and coordinated with the Implementing Agencies.

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Please see comment on STAR above.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Please see comment on STAR above.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

STAR amounts adjusted

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

- Public investment is normally classified as investment mobilized. Please revise those which are classified as ?recurrent expenditures?, and change them to ?investment mobilized?.

- In-kind is normally classified as ?recurrent expenditure? . Please revise those which are classified as ?investment mobilized?, and change them to ?recurrent expenditures?.

- Grant is normally classified as ?investment mobilized?. Please revise those which are classified as ?recurrent expenditures?, and change them to ?investment mobilized?.

- World Bank is GEF agency and co-implementing agency. Please change ?donor agency? to ?GEF agency?.

- Please change the co-finance of the AfDB from ?other? to ?Donor agency?.

Reviewer will provide separate email with all line items to correct.

05/04/2023: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

-This has been revised for each country child project concept note and portal entry, subsequently at the PFD level.

-This has been revised for each country child project concept note and portal entry, subsequently at the PFD level.

-This has been revised for each country child project concept note and portal entry, subsequently at the PFD level.

-This has been revised.

-This has been revised.

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: No.

Please compile all LoEs into one single file.

05/04/2023: Addressed. It is noted that 2 LoEs are outstanding.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed. All LoEs are now uploaded.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023:

All LOEs will be compiled and resubmitted. We are missing two.

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

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Not fully.

Please see comment on STAR above and address inconsistencies accordingly.

05/04/2023: Not fully.

- LOE from Mexico still reflect Uses of funds above, not Sources of funds as entered in Portal (see comment on financing tables)
- LOE from Viet Nam reflect different Sources of funds from Portal (see comment on financing tables)
- The re-submission did not correct the identified differences in either project titles, OFPs and /or Executing Partners between LOEs and Portal entries for the following countries: Angola, Brazil, Congo DR, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mozambique.

05/15/2023: Has been addressed.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

05/10/2023:

-Signed revised LoE from Mexico now reflects the Sources of Funds

-Signed revised LOE from Viet Nam now reflects the Sources of Funds in the portal

-Executing entities for Mexico, Angola, Brazil, South Africa, Mauritania, Congo DR, Viet Nam, Cote d'Ivoire, Mozambique, and Mali in the portal changed to match the LoEs

-In the case of GEF OFP name difference for Brazil, the GEF OFP has been recently changed, the new LOE has been secured

-In the case of GEF OFP name difference for Uzbekistan, kindly note that the LOE has two signatories namely, Jusipbek Kazbekov (Deputy Minister) and Jakhongir Talipov (GEF OFP), one of the signatories in the LOE is actually the GEF OFP.

-Titles of child projects for Mauritania, Congo DR, Cote d'Ivoire, and Mozambique in the portal changed to match that on the LoE

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: Yes.

Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program 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.

b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments n/a

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

04/17/2023: No. Please address comments made in this review.

05/04/2023: No. Please address comments made in this review.

05/15/2023: Yes. Program Manager recommends PFD clearance for work program inclusion.

Agency's Comments

05/01/2023 - responses to questions received via email.

Paragraph 103 has been amended to include the 20 child projects CI 3 targets and 4.1 related to biodiversity, and figure No. 2 showing Area of land under restoration and improved practices as it relates to GBF Target 2

Para 110 has been amended to add a more robust connection to Strassburg et al including Figure No.3. Map from Strassburg et al. 2020 showing optimizations converted lands with highest priority in dark red (top 5%) based on considering biodiversity, climate change mitigation, and cost-minimization priorities.

Table in para 113 has been amended based on updated distributions and categories that better align with the GEF programmatic directions (on systems), on the communities of practice (resilience, etc).

Para 111 has been amended to include a graphic (No. 4: Biomes (Source: Mapmaker National Geographic <https://mapmaker.nationalgeographic.org/map/>) that shows the different biomes among the 20 child projects in concordance with Strassburg et al.'s approach that the inclusion of several biomes is key to achieving multiple benefits as well as prioritizing the most valuable areas shown in previous new graphic in para 109 (Figure No.3. from Strassburg et al. 2020 showing optimizations converted lands with highest priority in dark red (top 5%) based on considering biodiversity, climate change mitigation, and cost-minimization priorities)

Para 104 amended to include Targets 18 and Target 14. The Program will track subsidy reform and policy development measured by indicator 1.1.3. ?At least one policy in 20 countries targeted for shifts to overcome restoration barriers and/or disincentives to further policy coherence and to enable private sector participation?

Para 105 amended to include both Target 2 and Target 8 since actions taken by the child projects will result in creating more resilient livelihoods to climate change impacts. Examples of DR Congo and Mexico approaches have been included to show that climate change resilience is one of the multiple global environmental benefits that the IP aims to achieve.

Para 106: The Program Level Results Framework will be measuring this in concrete ways as defined in the following indicators:

Indicator 3.1.1. has been edited to better identify the restoration practitioners by targeted groups for capacity building in financing capacity, multi-stakeholder organization and alignment to decrease the financing gap.

Indicator 3.1.1. The indicator is not focused on the decline in financing. It measures the decline in the financing gap, which demonstrates that the target groups were able to calculate the costs of financing plans, leverage resources, and properly channel or commit resources to the restoration plans. This indicator goes to the highest result level in the chain of accomplishment. A decline in the financing gap for key restoration activities, as defined by financing plans nested within restoration plans developed for restoration

geographies, ecosystems, and/or models. This will signal that the capacity to generate resources to support ecosystem restoration has been realized.

Indicator 3.1.3. has been amended to include more information. This is, however, an indicator and not a description of the outputs contributing to the Outcome 3.2. Rather, a measuring point established to indicate if and to what degree the outcome is achieved. The reader is referred to paragraphs

Indicator 3.2.2 has been modified to read, ?Number and types of stakeholders surveyed expressing benefits from program induced investments in the restoration continuum through enhanced efficiency, effectiveness, and livelihood benefits /or financing for restoration activities. Specific benefit baseline and targets will be determined during PPGs phases. The program will aggregate the suite of benefits from diverse restoration schemes seeking in the M&E baseline common benefits across all restoration and per restoration category, benefits tailored to the country and restoration type.

The following countries are reporting CI 1 sub-indicator 1.2: Chad (309,411 ha); Madagascar (250,000 ha); Uzbekistan (118,476); Vietnam (31,286 ha).

Country	4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity	4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations	4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems	4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) or other forest loss avoided
Angola	21,000.00	-	300,000.00	-
Brazil	-	-	1,200,000.00	-
Cambodia	15,000.00	-	-	-
Chad	-	-	2,261.00	-
Congo DR	5,398,440.00	-	-	-
Cote d'Ivoire	400,000.00	-	-	-
Haiti	-	-	127,800.00	-
Madagascar	75,000.00	-	-	-
Mali	30,000.00	30,000.00	10,000.00	15,000.00
Mauritania	15,000.00	-	55,000.00	-
Mozambique	-	-	80,000.00	-
Mexico	1,400,000.00	-	300,000.00	-
Nepal	-	-	-	-
Peru	23,366.00	-	80,839.00	498.00
Rwanda	-	-	29,500.00	-
Sao Tome and Principe	500.00	-	22,825.00	-
Sierra Leone	33,201.00	-	-	-
South Africa	40,000.00	-	-	-
Uzbekistan	200,000.00	-	-	1,000.00
Viet Nam	-	-	700,000.00	-
TOTAL	7,651,507.00	30,000.00	2,908,225.00	16,498.00

3rd technical briefing session on IPs and many other meetings between GEF and CI, informed the Agency the GEF Core Indicators and targets expected for this IP, quote: ?The program will contribute to the GEB Core Indicators as follows:

- CI 3: 4.3 million ha under restoration
- CI 4: 9.4 million ha under improved management
- CI 6: 80 million t CO₂eq sequestered / avoided

- CI 7: One shared freshwater ecosystem under new / improved cooperative management?

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		