

Reducing deforestation from palm oil and cocoa value chains

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10232

Countries

Liberia

Project Name

Reducing deforestation from palm oil and cocoa value chains

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

11/30/2020

Review completed by PM

7/21/2021

Program Manager

Paul Hartman

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

No, Table A should only include one FOLUR IP outcome, not multiple outcomes based on Focal Areas (which should appear in Table D). The Agency should edit the Table A Focal Area Outcomes field to read as follows: ?Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.? Please revise accordingly.

05/18/21

The objective in Table A 'Focal Area Outcomes' should be revised to be consistent with all other FOLUR CP submissions to read exactly as follows: ?Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.?

06/28/21

Table A has been revised. The project remains aligned.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

Table A focal area outcome updated.

CI-GEF 05/05/2021:

Table A revised

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following comments:

1) The Duration indicated of 18 Months is incorrect and not reflective of the expected implementation start and completion dates indicated.

2) This project objective should be bigger in scope and better aligned with the FOLUR design. The main goal of FOLUR is about transforming food systems. The project should be clear how it is contributing to this, not just incremental improvement. This starts with the project objective. Therefore, please revise the objective to reflect the following: a) Food security is potentially a positive co-benefit of the project but the project should be focused on environmental benefits as its priority. The goal should reflect this priority. b) Achieving sustainable production through efforts at the landscape level, including CSA, is an important approach contributing to project goals, but landscape level intervention isn't the only means intended to achieve desired outcomes by the project. More broadly, the project should consider how, in addition to efforts at the landscape, a replicable national model that also draws on policy, supply chain levers and market incentives to reduce deforestation and generate community benefits can be achieved. A project goal that better reflect this multi-layered approach would be more aligned with the FOLUR design

3) Table B outcomes appear to be quite broad. There should also be clear indicators for the outputs. In addition, please address the following comments on components

a) Component 1

- Should be TA not Investment

- The FOLUR program stresses a focus on integrated landscape management. How is this being captured in this component?

- Regarding Output 1.2.3- Gazettement package developed for Wologizi Proposed Protected Area, the FOLUR program is focused on production areas and not explicitly about protected area management or designation. As written this appears to be outside of the program scope and would need to be justified in the project narrative.

- There are references to 'coarse national land-use plans' etc. What is meant by this coarse designation?

- Outcome 1.3- 'Governance of NW Liberia Landscape by men and women strengthened' should be made more specific. The term governance is a broad concept. Is this governance improved or implemented (similar comment on outcome 1.3.1), and at what level: national, regional, district, local; governance in terms of management of land, decision making etc? Note: If the governance at the sub-national or local level is being targeted, how is this being scaled at the national level and helping to influence and shape national level governance on landscape management.

- Output 1.3.3- Two gender-sensitive regulations to improve integrated land-use planning and management in NW Liberia landscape and across Liberia. What provisions will be put in place for enforcement of these regulations?

b) Component 2

- Outcome 2.1- Please explain what is specifically the outcome sought by 'Increased resilience of men and women in NW Liberia Landscape'. Additionally, how do the two Outputs by themselves help to increase resilience and how does this contribute to the FOLUR goals?

- Outcome 2.2 'This outcome is very broad. Is this meant to read 'sustainable production practices'? It is unclear through what means this will be achieved as the outputs are not specific (What kinds of incentives? Producers are to be empowered to do what exactly?).

- Outcome 2.3- Strengthened policy framework for sustainable agricultural production by men and women. Please clarify how the related Output will lead to this Outcome? How does this translate to landscape level or the targeted site? It appears as if the output sought is merely to develop these and provide them to government. Will there be an effort to see them implemented at the national level?

- Outcome 2.4: 'Sufficient resources for sustainable production by men and women secured' is too broad. How is 'sufficient' being defined and what kind of production is considered? This should be reformulated.

- Are avenues such as the LDN Fund being explored for blended finance opportunities

- Please add Outcome level targets

c) Component 3

-Outcome 3.1 ? Is the plan to restore all of the degraded land? Areas identified as providing critical ecosystem services, etc? Please clarify

- How are the land use plans and landscape restoration plans connected.

- Again, targets would be useful here.

d) Component 4

- Should be categorized as TA not Investment.

-Reference should be made to how the project will link to the Global platform and other FOLUR countries in the region.

05/18/21

1.The project duration has been revised. Cleared

2. Objective is now better aligned with the program design. Cleared

3. Agency has indicated targets are included in table B, and while these are included in the uploaded CER document, these are missing in Table B of the portal CER but are found in the narrative description. Please upload these to Table B of the portal.

Component 1

- This has been changed to TA. Cleared

- Focus on integrated landscape management has been better explained. Cleared

- 1.2.3 Justification on why the project is focusing on protected area gazettelement has been sufficiently laid out in the CER and prodoc. Cleared

- Coarse national land-use plans has been explained. Cleared

- 1.3 & 1.3.1 ? It has been clarified that this will focus on North West Oil Palm Landscape Forum which will intersect also with National level platforms. Cleared

1.3.3 The revisions improve the output it but it would be clearer if the words ?developed and implemented? are included at the end of this output in Table B.

Component 2

This has been fully revised. It is now cleared.

Component 3

3.1 ? Outcome 3.1 in Table B should be revised to reflect that restoration efforts will be focused areas crucial in ensuring ecosystem integrity and connectivity in NW Liberia.

-Other comments in component 3 are cleared

Component 4

- Component categorization has been changed to TA. Cleared

- Link to the Global platform and other FOLUR countries in the region has been clarified. Cleared.

06/28/21

- 1.3.3 is still missing the terms 'developed and implemented' in Table B description in the portal version of the CER. Please revise.

07/13/21

The above comments have been responded to sufficiently. In addition, please address the following comment:

The project objective in Annex A is not the same as in Table B and elsewhere in project documents. Please update the objective in Annex A accordingly for consistency.

07/21/21

The Project Objective is now consistent throughout the documents. The project design is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/21/2021:

Project Objective revised throughout document.

CI-GEF 07/07/2021:

implemented added to Output 1.3.3.

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

3) Targets included in table B

- "developed and implemented" included in Output 1.3.3 and through the CEO ER/ProDoc where this output is mentioned

- Addressed. Outcome 3.1 has been rephrased as: Degraded areas that are crucial for ensuring ecosystem connectivity and integrity restored in NW Liberia (highlighted in yellow in ProDoc and CEO ER everywhere where this outcome is mentioned)

CI-GEF 05/05/2021:

1) the 18 months duration is greyed out in the portal and the agency is unable to change this.

2) Project objective revised to read:

To promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable food systems for improved livelihoods in NW Liberia Landscape through land use planning, restoration of degraded lands, and strengthening governance, policies, and market incentives for nationally replicable models of deforestation-free cocoa and palm oil value chains.

3) a) Outcome and output indicators are available in the detailed Results Framework in Annex A. Table B includes targets for outcomes and outputs.

- Comp 1 changed to TA

- Added the following on p. 25 of ProDoc, par. 89:

Integrated landscape management refers to long-term collaboration among different groups of land managers and stakeholders to achieve the multiple objectives required from the landscape. Stakeholders seek to solve shared problems or capitalize on new opportunities that reduce trade-offs and strengthen synergies among different landscape objectives. Although there are many different approaches to integrated landscape management, with different entry points, processes and institutional arrangements,

common features include broad stakeholder participation, negotiation around objectives and strategies, and adaptive management based on shared learning. To these ends, the project will work through a coalition of partners, government authorities and other stakeholders, through an existing land use planning working group that already is in place; a first step in the process will be to jointly develop a vision for the landscape. Land use planning will identify areas for protection, conservation, and production, which will be delineated in an inclusive and participatory manner; a landscape management body will be established with responsibility for ensuring implementation of the land use plans; and this body will be supported by regulations on integrated land use planning and management to be developed by the project. Lessons learned from the land use planning process will be documented and shared for adaptive management.

- Output 1.2.3: revised as follows (pp. 27 ProDoc):

Output 1.2.3: Land-Use Planning results inform the development of a gazettelement package for Wologizi Proposed Protected Area

Par. 96. Protected Areas are anchors for landscape resilience in the NW Liberia Landscape, vital for ecosystem services through maintenance of forest cover, watersheds, and biodiversity habitat. The LUP process will generate key data and information, including stakeholder consultations and planning inputs, which converge with the requirements of PA gazettelement packages. Thus, the Project will help consolidate the PA network by supporting development of the gazettelement package for the Wologizi Proposed Protected Area (99,538 ha). This activity will be led by FFI and entails aligning LUP results with steps defined by the FDA in preparation for PA declaration, including documentation of ecological values; threat assessments; socioeconomic assessments; community consultations and Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) processes; multi-stakeholder consultations with local and national government; and detailed mapping and delineation of PA metes and bounds. Using these LUP results, FFI will work with the FDA on preparation of a draft legislative act to establish the Wologizi Protected Area. Upon completion of this output, the FDA will be ready to submit the gazettelement package for consideration by Cabinet and recommendation to the legislature.

- Added clarification on p. 25 ProDoc: At the national level, a coarse national land use plan will be developed, relying on secondary/desktop research; at the landscape level, detailed land use plans will be developed based on secondary data as well as primary data to be collected under the project.

- Added to Outcome description on p. 28 ProDoc, par. 97:

A landscape forum - North West Oil Palm Landscape Forum (NWOPLF) - was established under the GGP, covering the Counties of Bomi and Grand Cape Mount. Under this project, NWOPLF will be extended to other Counties (Lofa, Bong, and Gbarpolu) in the NW Liberia landscape to ensure stakeholder participation, dialogue and approval, and to facilitate inter-agency and multi-sectoral coordination. NWOPLF will

meet quarterly to review and discuss local developments and project activities. The scope of NWOPLF will be broadened to not only cover oil palm but also the cocoa value chain, thus promoting long-term sustainable palm oil and cocoa production by providing a mechanism for convening and coordinating between public and private sectors to define sustainability priorities and policies. The FOLUR project will support and strengthen NWOPLF members on management, conflict resolution, and resource mobilization and in developing a long-term venue in which public and private sectors can align and develop joint actions to mitigate negative impacts of palm oil and cocoa production and maximize productivity. This will strengthen the enabling environment for sustainable production in Liberia. Further reinforcing national impact, there will be frequent interactions and cross-representation/coordination between NWOPLF and the National Oil Palm Platform of Liberia (NOPPOL) and National Cocoa Sector Platform.

- Added to Output 1.3.3. description on p. 29 ProDoc:

To ensure these regulations are enforced, the project will partner with and build the capacity of key stakeholders including government ministries and agencies with enforcement mandates such as FDA, EPA, MIA, and MoGCSP etc. In addition, the landscape governance structure will be strengthened to enforce these regulations at the sub-national level in collaboration with the line government ministries and agencies

b) Component 2:

Outcome 2.1 and outcome 2.2 merged, now reads (starting p. 30 ProDoc):

Outcome 2.1: Improved sustainable production of food and commodity crops to enhance ecological resilience of NW Liberia Landscape

Target 2.1a: 200,000 hectares under sustainable land management

Target 2.1b: 100,000 ha under improved management to benefit biodiversity

Par. 104. Resilience in the Northwest Liberia Landscape is threatened by pressure on ecosystems from traditional and conventional resource use. Commercial oil palm development may convert a large parcel of forest to monoculture; forests are threatened by timber concessions without planning, monitoring and enforcement; potential mining in the landscape can lead to intense concentrations of negative impact on ecosystems. Meanwhile, farmers rely on shifting cultivation and conventional practices that threaten further deforestation and degradation. These pressures threaten continual impoverishment of the resource base and loss of ecosystem services, and thus a general decline in resilience. By introducing climate smart agriculture and sustainable management practices, supported by strengthened participation in value chains that reward sustainable choices, the project will facilitate the transition toward a more resilient development trajectory based on deforestation-free commercial agroforestry.

Par. 105. Building on land-use planning and capacity-building with respect to climate-smart agriculture through training and demonstrations, the project will extend sustainable practices to 100,000 ha of land under production of food and commodity crops, through direct work with project beneficiaries. Achieving this level of adoption

will require incentive mechanisms and institutional development, to motivate and make possible behavior change at scale. The spatial configuration of this behavior change will depend on outcomes of land-use planning processes, but a substantial focus may be anticipated in and around the existing commercial oil palm concession; analysis conducted for UNDP suggests that on the order of 120,000 ha of the concession may be suitable for sustainable smallholder oil palm development.

Output 2.1.1: Capacity of male and female farmers, small-medium enterprise service providers, government, universities, and civil society, and organizational staff built on climate-smart agricultural practices and non-timber forest products (NTFP) practices with a focus on palm oil and cocoa value chains

Par. 106. The project will conduct a wide-reaching awareness and training program to expose stakeholders throughout the landscape to climate-smart agricultural alternatives, prioritizing palm oil and cocoa value chains and, in response to community priorities, also addressing NTFP opportunities. This package of practices will emphasize livelihood options that do not rely on continual forest conversion, but instead benefit from the presence of healthy forest ecosystems. (In addition to livelihood diversification, emphasis on NTFPs helps strengthen the case for forest conservation and restoration activities). This campaign will reach at least 10,000 beneficiaries; recognizing that exposure does not result in 100% of beneficiaries immediately changing behavior, this size audience will ensure an initial critical mass of early adopters. Producers will be trained on farming as a business, post-harvest handling, and market information systems. The content of this capacity-building program will be developed by contracted subject-matter experts working with FDA, the Ministry of Agriculture, EPA and civil society organizations to also generate institutional capacity growth.

Output 2.1.2: Climate-smart agricultural practices demonstrated by men and women

par. 107. The most effective way to convince farmers to adopting new methods is through practical demonstration. The project will include 20 demonstration sites where farmers will receive direct assistance in applying climate-smart practices. These sites will provide the basis for developing learning and dissemination materials (e.g. videos), and also be available for learning-visits for farmer-representatives from other communities. The sites will be selected as an output of the landscape-level land-use planning process, with the intent to achieve geographical diversity within the landscape as well as inclusion of different products (i.e. oil palm, cocoa, food crops).

Output 2.1.3: Incentives for responsible palm oil and cocoa, and food crops provided for men and women

Par. 108. The principal incentives for responsible production will consist of access to initial financing for agroforestry development, and market access and/or price premiums linked to global markets for sustainable palm oil and cocoa. The project will work to incorporate small farmers into these value chains through partnerships with larger private sector operators. One form of such links will be private sector engagement with commercial aggregators, who can combine supplies purchased from smallholders for onward sale to international buyers. Another is linking smallholder oil palm cultivation to the Mano Palm Oil Plantation as purchaser of output to feed the Mano mill. Access to

initial financing will be linked to commitments to zoning and regulations developed under land-use plans, which thereby also forms an incentive for conservation-compatible food crop production. Other bespoke incentives will be defined using participatory processes during the design of conservation agreements with communities. These incentives will reach at least 20,000 beneficiaries by the end of the project, most of whom will be smallholders entering either the palm oil or cocoa sectors.

Par. 109. In addition to encouraging initial adoption of sustainable practices, the following measures will seek to provide market access and/or price premiums to ensure that sustainable practices endure after initial financing:

? Improving access of smallholder cocoa and palm oil farmers to high quality cocoa and palm oil seeds by linking them to seed suppliers and private sector such as MANO for palm oil and Theobroma for cocoa.

? Establishing VSLAs and cooperatives to improve farmers' access to credit

? Development of credible certification programme for NW Liberia Landscape cocoa and palm oil

? Strengthening existing cooperatives for activities such as extension, training, seeds and nursery, pre- and post- harvest technologies, and other agricultural products processing and marketing.

Output 2.1.4: Community producers (men and women) of key commodities empowered and organized in a locally appropriate manner (cooperatives and other associations)

Par. 110. Individuals face challenges with respect to value chain participation, for example in qualifying for investment finance, securing agricultural inputs, or negotiating prices for outputs. To demonstrate a means of overcoming these challenges, the project will work with sets of producers to establish formal bodies to serve their collective interests. The nature of these bodies will be determined through a participatory process that responds to the needs and concerns of participating producers, but in essence will seek to capture the strengths of agricultural cooperative models. To demonstrate the potential benefits of such arrangements, the project will help producers organize through the establishment and/or strengthening of at least one cooperative or association in each of the four Counties in the project geography.

- Addressed in new merged Outcome 2.1 and 2.2 per above.

- Added text to description of Output 2.2.1 to read (starting on p. 32 ProDoc):

Par. 113. Building on lessons derived from demonstrations of practices and facilitation of incentives for sustainable agricultural production, the project will develop at least two policy recommendations for new regulations that support such production. Feasible and impactful areas for such regulatory recommendations will be identified over the course of execution but may be expected to include reinforcement of the linkages between sustainable agriculture and land-use planning, and between sustainable agriculture and maintenance of natural capital. Current policies on agriculture will be reviewed to ensure that sustainable production issues faced by women in NW Liberia landscape are addressed and incorporated in the five County Development plans, and/or National

development plans and policies. All policy work will be conducted in collaboration with the relevant stakeholders including those in Government charged with the implementation and monitoring of these policies.

Par. 114. Priorities for policy work will be determined together with other stakeholders, through the NWOPLF. Building on GGP work, priorities for consideration include:

? Passage of land use policy developed under the GGP project to improve the land use planning framework at the national level, support landscape approaches for land use planning and allow more appropriate demarcation of forest land and protection of land that still has forest cover, and improve monitoring of land use.

? Build on Conservation Agreement legislation drafted under the GGP project, to reinforce the legal basis for use of CAs to facilitate land use planning, conservation and community benefits in production landscapes, and strengthen the legal basis for dedicating national sustainable financing mechanisms to CA maintenance.

? Build on policy recommendations informed by the GGP's Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) with respect to commercial and smallholder oil palm plantation development, notably on financing for development of sustainable smallholder palm oil production.

Par. 115. To enhance the likelihood that policy work will have concrete impact, the project will include strengthening institutional capacities of key government agencies and ministries to effectively carry out their respective mandates, and coordination. Key entities to target include:

? The Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), for it to provide climate smart agricultural extension and advisory services to farmers

? Liberia Agricultural Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), enacted by national law to improve the regulatory environment for trade

? The Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) established with the mandate of training and certifying cooperatives

? The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with the mandate of guiding Liberia towards compliance with national and international environmental laws

? Forestry Development Authority as a custodian of the protected areas network and other forested lands in Liberia

- Removed 'sufficient' throughout the ProDoc

- Added to Output description on p. 37 ProDoc: Another potential impact investor that may offer a good fit is the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Fund.

- Outcome and Output indicators provided in Results Framework and Section 3A

c) Component 3:

- Only those areas crucial in ensuring ecosystem integrity and connectivity were selected using spatial analysis (GIS) and the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). The analysis covered geographic, economic, and social aspects of the NW Liberia landscape, to help prioritize target areas for the project and optimize the impacts of interventions for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation using four main criteria: (a) value for conservation, (b) vulnerability to forest degradation, (c) vulnerability to deforestation, and (d) viability for intervention. Spatial data layers were

created for the first three criteria, and for the fourth criterion, a qualitative assessment of the conditions for implementing project interventions was used and included assessing the strength of the governance and regulatory mechanisms that are associated with the dominant land uses in NW Liberia and the capacity of the decision-making institutions associated with those land use. By combining spatial layers into a single score, the sites with the highest conservation value forest and the greatest vulnerability were identified. This is described this way in the ProDoc

- Restoration plan is a sub-set of a land use plan. The land use plan will identify areas where restoration can be done. However, a restoration plan will detail out specific areas that will be restored using either natural regeneration and Assisted Natural Regeneration - agroforestry, fallow etc, as well as the different crops and/or tree species. This is described this way in the ProDoc.

- Added to Output 3.1.1 description (p. 34 ProDoc): Thus, the plan will build on the process used to define the target of 15,000 ha, based on spatial analysis and ROAM methodology as described above

Component 4

- changed to TA

- Added to Component 4 description (p. 36 ProDoc):

Par. 128. The project will engage with global, regional, and national networks, platforms and initiatives on cocoa and palm oil commodities to share experiences and allow for cooperation and networking among peers, awareness raising and ultimately upscaling. For palm oil, the project will engage using existing multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms at the national and landscape levels established under the Good Growth Partnership (GGP) including the National Oil Palm Platform of Liberia and Northwest Liberia landscape Oil Palm Forum; for cocoa, the project will engage with the Liberia Cocoa Sector Working Group. These platforms will act as the main knowledge hubs to share lessons and to maximize engagement of all stakeholders on the ground.

Par. 129. The project will also engage with regional platforms and initiatives focusing on cocoa and palm oil value chains (e.g., African Palm Oil Initiative, African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative (AFR100), and West Africa Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance (WACSAA) through South-South cooperation and exchange visits with other FOLUR beneficiary countries in West Africa (Ivory Coast, Ghana, and Guinea). At the Global level, the project will engage with various bodies such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA) and Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), Global Landscape Forum (GLF), the One Planet network (10YFP) Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) Programme, World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), UNDP Green Commodities Programme, and FOLUR-specific collaboration mechanisms that will be established.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) ?Fauna and Flora International? is listed as ?Flora and Fauna International? in the portal table. Their co-financing letter informs that the type of co-financing (\$2m) is cash and in-kind. This doesn?t match what is indicated in Table C. Please revise to reflect what is in the co-financing letter.

2) The investments mobilized should be described under Table C.

05/18/21

1. Revisions are sufficient. Cleared

2. FFI?s co-financing has been split into two in table C of the CER portal upload, but both are now listed as grants. This should be changed to match what is currently shown in the uploaded version of the CER document.

06/28/21

FFI?s co-financing has now been split in table C between grant and in-kind.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

Co-financing letter from FFI indicates in-kind and grant. The co-financing is reflected in the portal as Grant/Investment Mobilized: 1,060,000 and In-kind/ recurrent 940,000

CI-GEF 05/05/2021:

- Corrections made in pages, 3, 4, 11, 80, and 164.

co-financing has been made to reflect the US\$ 2 million (US\$ 940,000 in-kind and US\$ 1,060,000 as grant contributions) from FFI

- Description below added to the CEO ER

Description: The investments mobilized are leveraged resources based on engagement with partners and collaborators. This includes co-financing from various organizations such as: International NGOs (CI, RSPB, FFI, and IDH); National NGOs (SCNL); recipient governments (EPA, LLA, LISGIS, FDA, and MoA), and private sector (Mano). The investments mobilized are in form of grants, staff support, use of equipment, corporate social responsibility, etc. All the investments have been confirmed and co-finance letters obtained.

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

12/15/20

No. Table D has several mistakes: the LD resources requested are wrongly referenced as ?Multi Focal Area? and ?IP FOLU Set-Aside? and the fees are those of the FOLU incentive. Please revise.

05/18/21

1. The STAR financing from LD and BD (\$4,809,943) and incentive financing (\$2,329,507) don't appear to be at a 2:1 ratio (it would seem that the Incentive should equal \$2,404,971.5?). Please check the calculation in the CEO ER and revise accordingly or explain.

2. While the total fee equals 9%, the ratio per FA and incentive varies. Please justify or revise.

3. It also appears that the PMC is less than 5%, and that the co-financing contribution to the PMC isn't proportionate to the GEF contribution. Co-financing contributes less than 1% to PMC, which should be revised to be more proportionate with the GEF PMC contribution.

4. On the budget table excel file, it's not clear which budget items/project activities are under which entities. Also, the substance of many items is not clear. Please address the following comments on the budget:

a) Please indicate for each line items in the budget table the responsible executing entity i.e. either CI Liberia or Government or other Partners.

b) Please clarify what is "in-house" consultants? Are they CI staff or consultants?

c) Staff- Finance Lead/Overall Financial and contract management can be charged 100% to PMC.

d) Please clarify what is "Grants-In-Kind Grant" to different partners?

e) Please justify the need for Landcruiser Hardtop - 2 vehicles, as we don't encourage vehicle purchase using GEF funding and appeal to agency explore co-financing sources to cover this item.

f) The following items can be charged to PMC: Office Desks and printers, Allocation of rent to programs, Office telephone and internet expense, Exchange rate on int'l travel.

g) Please clarify Country Office Support Cost. If CI-Liberia has already charged some of its staff costs, consultant costs, travel, equipment and operating costs, how can this Country Office Support Cost be justified? Please provide Government's agreement on this cost.

06/28/21

All responses provided are sufficient. Financing presented in Table D is adequate and the project demonstrates a cost-effective approach.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

1) the numbers in the portal align with the numbers signed by the Operational Focal Point in the Letter of Endorsement for the child project. We cannot change these numbers at this time.

2) Numbers are taken from the LOE.

3) 3. Co-financing has been revised to account for in-kind co-financing from the government as part of PMC activities in their operations of projects that are contributing to the goals of this one.

4.a For the section under Personnel and Professional Services the funds will flow to CI-Liberia, however the costs for consultancies starting in rows 17-27 will be services procured following competitive procurement processes. For Travel, meetings and workshops, while the funds come to CI-Liberia, most of the funding is geared towards paying for community meetings, workshops and paying for regional engagement in Africa and a Global engagement, who will be a Government of Liberia representative over the 5 years, or about 10 trips. There will be 1 CI Liberia staff that will also be going on those trips. The budget template has been updated to better reflect the funds that goes to each entity. While the funding will flow through CI-Liberia, the notes now provide additional information on which line items will benefit communities and the Government of Liberia.

4.b In-house Consultants are CI employees who provide technical expertise that is required for the project implementation. These individuals provide services based on Terms of Reference with clear project-specific deliverables. In-house consultants should only be dedicated to the project at 50% or less level of effort. The terms of references are attached in the ProDoc.

4.c The role of the overall Finance Lead is not just focusing on project management activities. This role will provide capacity building to all sub-grantees to assure that they have in place all systems and policies to assure compliance with the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards, which is not a project management cost, and therefore has been budgeted across components

4.d In-kind grants are donations of goods or services to third parties who will use the use goods or services to implement a project. In-kind grants are used when it is more practical or effective than awarding a cash grant to a recipient and where a CI donor requires monitoring of project goods and equipment. In particular, under this FOLUR project CI-Liberia is providing in-kind grants to the following government agencies: Environment Protection Agency, The Forestry Development Authority, Ministry of Agriculture, Liberia Land Authority, and Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geographical Information Services. This is under Section 235 and 236 of the Prodoc for reference.

4.e The vehicle justification form has been added now as an annex, which provides a cost-benefit analysis of the cost of renting vs. buying. While we understand that the GEF

discourages the purchase of vehicles, and prefer this to be co-financed, there simply isn't funding within the government to co-finance this.

4.f Please note that we have removed the costs for office desk to PMC. The exchange rate was moved to the travel line, which is a fee associated with the travel. The office telephone and rent is for the Sustainable Production Specialist, which is based on the U.S. and has separate rent expenses from CI-Liberia. Since this position is solely supporting component 4, the global coordination, the charges to rent and office telephone and internet are based on that person's level of effort into the project.

4.g Country office support costs are costs such as office rent, utilities, office supplies, certain office equipment, and support staff that benefit the country office's portfolio of projects. CI country office support costs are allocated to projects using a consistent methodology as described below in order to equitably allocate the costs to Donors.

1) Calculation of the ratio of project support costs in the previous fiscal year to the country program's total non-administrative salary expenses for the same period;

2) Allocation of the project support costs each month by multiplying the ratio calculated above by the non-support salary charges; and

3) Monitoring of the rate throughout the year by CI's HQ Finance and adjustment of the rate as necessary. Thus, these costs do not fall under the staff costs that are directly charged to the projects and it is based on the level of effort of those positions charged across all components, M&E and PMC. This is an essential cost that directly relates to supporting the delivery of the project.

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

Updated.

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
12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1. The box "PPG Required" box should be checked.
2. In Table F, the BD resources are referenced as "Climate Change" under the Focal Area column. Please revise.

05/18/21

The comments have been sufficiently addressed. The status and utilization of the PPG is clear.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

CI is unable to change the PPG information as it is greyed out.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1. In general, the areas restored and under improved management are very important. It is unclear how they were estimated. Please justify these results through acceptable means (references, estimate of cost per ha, etc)?
2. GHG mitigated results: 5,468,072 tCO₂e are reported as derived outside the AFOLU sector (sub-indicator 6.2), which isn't correct. This should be accounted for instead under core indicator 6.1. There is no Duration of accounting and the Anticipated start year of accounting is 2026. The Ex-ACT tool which is used for the calculation should be uploaded in the package.

05/18/21

The number of hectares of areas restored and under improved management are justified and reasonable (comment 1 above), however, the targeted GHG emission mitigation (96 million ton of emissions reductions) is very high. The Agency needs to ensure the calculation reflect the project activities and revise the Ex-ACT tool. It may be

worthwhile to arrange a call between CI and the GEF to discuss how to resolve the below comments if beneficial to the Agency:

1) Indicator 3.1: 15,000 ha are reported under sub-indicator 3.1 (ag restoration) while in Ex-ACT tool it is afforestation/reforestation (it is very different in terms of GHG mitigation).

2) Indicator 4.1: 100,000 ha of improved management to benefit biodiversity. We suggest a more conservative approach targeting a degradation level with the project as ?low? or ?moderate? instead of ?very low?.

3) Indicator 4.3: the project speaks about improved practices of Cocoa and Palm oil production. But in Ex-ACT, this GEB is considered as plantations of Cocoa and Palm oil on degraded land (it is a land use change). The information in Ex-ACT needs to be consistent with the project description which doesn't seem to be the case here.

4) Indicator 4.4:

a- The area reported under HCVF loss avoided is in fact the area corresponding to the conservation agreements that will be signed with communities. Would all this forest area be lost without the project? Only the anticipated forest loss should be reported and it should be a portion of the area under conservation depending on the deforestation rate without the project.

b - The name of the HCVF area should be indicated and ideally the GIS file presented. If not already recognized by the HCV network, research documents justifying the HCV classification should be referenced and the criteria ?submitted? checked in the Portal (this document is in the Prodoc).

5) The following mitigation sources are added in the Ex-ACT tool and it is unclear to which activities they are related in the project:

a - 50,000 ha of afforestation/reforestation (not reported as core indicator) (it contributes to the result with 22 M tCO₂e)

b - There is an important deforestation avoided estimate in the Ex-ACT tool (it contributes to the result with 34 M tCO₂e) but we don't know where the numbers are coming from (it should be a fraction of the forest area under SFM).

6) Finally on GHG core indicator:

a - In the Portal, Anticipated start year of accounting should be 2021 or 2022 but not 2041. Duration of accounting is missing and it should be listed as 20 years.

b - The Anticipated start year of accounting in 2026 should be removed under the sub-indicator 6.2

06/28/21

1) Thanks for sharing the revised Ex-ACT tool. While the GHG emissions result has been reduced somewhat, we still believe that it is highly ambitious, particularly based

the expectation that the project will generate a near total reduction of deforestation over an area of more than 246k ha. The track record in the area to defend such an assumption wouldn't seem to bear this out and as such we suggest a more conservative approach, which could mean estimating a more likely reduction of the deforestation rate by 1/3 or 1/2.

2) In addition, it is still unclear what the project intends to do with the 100,000 ha ?to benefit biodiversity?: is this palm oil plantations as said in the project description or tropical rain forest in the EX-ACT tool? What exactly is the state of the land area without and with the project and where the carbon sequestration comes from if this land is palm oil plantation? A less degraded forest is very different to an improved crop landscape.

The 2 points above are primary reasons why we think the expected result is currently too high. If taken into account, we estimate that the result estimate could be reduced by about 40% from what is currently shown in CI 6.

07/13/21

The comments above have been addressed. In addition, please address the following:

Please embed ?Greenhouse gas emission mitigated (Target: 36,134,316 tCO₂e)? within the results framework to clarify the causal chain leading to this result, perhaps as an outcome. We appreciate it is an indirect result, but it would be helpful to root it into the result framework as appropriate.

07/21/21

The response provided is sufficient. The core indicator targets are realistic.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/21/2021:

Greenhouse gas emission mitigated (Target: 36,134,316 tCO₂e) can be found as Objective Indicator D in the Results Framework. We prefer to keep it there because they are the result of achieving the hectares mentioned under outcome indicators 1.2b, 2.1a, 2.1b, and 3.1.

CI-GEF 07/07/2021:

On the EX-ACT tool, we have made the following changes.

1) We have reduced the number of hectares of HCV forest loss that the project proposes to avoid from 50,000 ha to 15,000 ha. As a result, the avoided emissions from reduced deforestation changed from 38,088,412 tCO₂e to 11,426,524 tCO₂e.

2) On the management tab, row 13, the area that will be degraded has been changed from Forest Zone 1 to Plantation Zone 1. As a result of this, the value changed from 16,830,660 tCO₂e to 9,275,567 tCO₂e

Thus, the overall carbon balance of the project changed from -70,351,298 tCO₂e to -36,134,316 tCO₂e.

So, the total CO₂ mitigated (indicator 6) is now: 36,134,316 tCO₂e, and this is reflected in the ProDoc and the CEO ER (highlighted in yellow). Also, the number of number of hectares of HCV forest loss that the project proposes to avoid has been reduced from 50,000 ha to 15,000 ha (change reflected in ProDoc and CEO ER, highlighted in yellow). This also reduced the total number of hectares under core indicator 4 from 350,000 ha to 315,000 ha (highlighted in yellow)

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

The emission reductions reduced from 96 million tons to 70 million tons after addressing the comments as indicated below. The changes have been made in the ProDoc paragraph 153 on page 44, appendix 1 results framework on page 83 and on Indicator six under GEF core indicators on page 104. and map on page 8 revised to include Golakonneh HCVF area. These changes have also been included in the CEO endorsement template (highlighted in yellow) in the results framework, core indicator table, and description of the GEBs. The Ex-Act tool has been adjusted as follows:

1. On the LUC tab, 15,000 ha for restoration has been moved from Afforestation/reforestation to Other Land use change because the degraded agricultural land will be restored using shaded agroforestry system ? cocoa and palm oil.
2. The level of degradation with the project scenario has been changed from very low to low.
3. Improved agricultural practices for cocoa and palm oil production in 15,000 ha of degraded agricultural land restored has been reflected in the tool. In addition, improved management options of 200,000 ha of production land has been reflected under the crop land tab
4. a) This has been addressed under the LUC tab to reflect only the anticipated loss that would have occurred without the project based on the annual deforestation rate of 1.06%

b) The name of the HCVF area is Golakonneh; shapefile produced name and research documents justifying its status as HCVF uploaded

5. a) 50,000 ha of HCVF loss avoided has been removed from afforestation/reforestation to deforestation section under the LUC tab

b) This has been rectified and is no longer there.

6. a) In the portal, Start year of accounting is 2021 and the duration of accounting is 20 years.

b) the anticipated year of accounting under the sub-indicator 6.2 removed

CI-GEF 05/05/2021:

Added note to Core Indicators table in Appendix IV (starting on p. 107 ProDoc) and in the box below the CEO ER/portal

* The target for total area under improved practices (350,000 ha) was developed as below:

? Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity is 100,000 ha

? Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems is 200,000 ha

? Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided is 50,000 ha

These targets and sites were selected based on the following:

1. Only those areas crucial in ensuring ecosystem integrity and connectivity were selected using spatial analysis (GIS) and the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). The analysis covered geographic, economic, and social aspects of the NW Liberia landscape, to help prioritize target areas for the project and optimize the impacts of interventions for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation using four main criteria: (a) value for conservation, (b) vulnerability to forest degradation, (c) vulnerability to deforestation, and (d) viability for intervention. Spatial data layers were created for the first three criteria, and for the fourth criterion, a qualitative assessment of the conditions for implementing project interventions was used and included assessing the strength of the governance and regulatory mechanisms that are associated with the dominant land uses in NW Liberia and the capacity of the decision-making institutions associated with those land use. By combining spatial layers into a single score, the sites with the highest conservation value forest and the greatest vulnerability were identified.

2. The total HCVF area that is outside of the formal protected areas is 246,007 ha. So, through the project, conservation agreements will be signed with communities to with nine clans to conserve 50,000 ha of HCVF areas outside formal protection. This 50,000 ha was determined using GIS as the area of land under the jurisdictions of the nine selected clans

3. Costs per hectares. A study done in 2011 by FDA and UNDP that showed that the cost per hectare for Sustainable forest management is US\$ 2.50., and the cost per hectare for Afforestation and Reforestation is USD\$150.00 (Kantor and UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Investment and Financial Flows for mitigation in the forestry sector in Liberia).

4. A stakeholder workshop was conducted where the results of this analysis were validated.

Requested adjustments have been made in the ProDoc. The total emissions reductions have been calculated with the EX-ACT tool and have been adjusted. The EX-ACT tool is uploaded with the package

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) Please note that as the FOLUR Libeira project is a child project of an Impact Program, there was no PIF and reference in this document should be removed or the terminology changed to reflect the project concept at the PFD stage.

2) As there was no PIF, the CEO ER should be a stand-alone document, serving as the primary file through which the project is described. Where feasible, please include relevant and required information in the CEO ER rather than having much of the important details in the ProDoc alone.

3) With regard to Global environmental problems identified in the CEO ER, these are entirely global without any reference to how they play out in-country. It will be necessary to include a description of how the Liberian context is related to these problems, and more specifically in the project area (much of which can be pulled from the ProDoc). Specific background on the project should be included in subsequent sections of the CEO ER as well. Please revise.

4) While the project is focused on improving the sustainability of palm oil or cocoa, there is no mention of these crops and their negative externalities in this section of the CEO ER. Neither globally nor in Liberia.

5) There is no mention of the challenges related to policy concerns on how to bring these commercial commodities into a high forest country in a way that is environmentally sustainable and beneficial to local communities. Some of these policies are currently a focus of the GEF GGP project in Liberia, but they aren't reference as barriers to addressing environmental concerns.

6) While Poverty is highlighted as a barrier, there is no mention in the CEO ER of other social concerns that may flow from this (e.g conflict, human rights abuses, child labor issues etc) that may be a particular challenge within the Liberia context.

05/18/21

The comments have been adequately addressed. There is sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental problems are going to be addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 05/05/2021:

1) All references to PIF eliminated from CEO ER throughout document, replaced with project concept.

2) Additional information from revised ProDoc transferred to CEO ER throughout document, per substantive comments in this Review Sheet.

3) Added material below to Section 2D, starting p. 13 ProDoc and in CEO ER/portal

Par. 51. Regarding the focal sectors of the proposed project, both cocoa and oil palm represent potential sources of environmental problems in the NW Liberia Landscape. The cocoa sector in Liberia fell dormant during years of civil conflict, and only recently and slowly has begun to re-emerge. Although cocoa cultivation has not yet become a significant driver of deforestation in the country, experience with cocoa elsewhere in the region provides a strong rationale for intervening before it does. As emphasized in Ingram et al. (2018), development of the cocoa sector in major producer countries such as Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana has been accompanied by negative environmental impacts such as deforestation, soil degradation, and soil and water pollution, as well as social challenges such as persistently poor labor conditions and the use of child and forced labor. Insufficient attention to sustainability issues result in a sector characterized by old trees, pests and diseases, which lower tree productivity and stimulate further forest clearing (Niesten et al. 2004). These trends are exacerbated in weak governance

contexts, leaving both ecosystems and communities vulnerable to negative impacts of unplanned land use and development.

Par. 52. Humid tropical regions like the NW Liberia Landscape that are ideal for oil palm are also home to the world's tropical rainforests. Conversion of complex forest ecosystems to monoculture oil palm plantations reduces diversity in tree species by 99 percent, eliminating habitat for a wide range of animal species, with reductions in mammal diversity as high as 90 percent (IUCN 2018). IUCN (2018) notes that "Over the last four decades, species have slid towards extinction twice as fast in Indonesia as in any other country" at least in part as a result of forest conversion for oil palm production. About half of oil palm expansion worldwide since the early 1970s has involved forest clearing; the rest replaced cropland, pastureland and other land uses. Oil palm plantation establishment typically is followed by pollution, with runoff of fertilizers and pesticides fouling freshwater systems in and around the plantations. The negative social impacts of large-scale development of commercial oil palm plantations are similarly well-documented (Brad et al. 2018; Greenpeace 2018; Meijaard and Sheil 2019). These impacts include land-grabbing and displacement of communities to make way for cultivation; manipulation of local people through bribery and false promises; and a cynical disconnect between stated government policies and enforcement of these policies on the ground (Lustgarten 2018). In NW Liberia, conflicts over land rights, community benefits and employment conditions have stymied concession development and blunted potential positive contributions of palm oil to socioeconomic development, and the sector remains vulnerable to social risks that accompany resource-based economic development in areas with weak governance (UNDP 2020).

4) Added material below to Section 2D, starting p. 13 (see above).

5) Added to Section 2E (p. 15-16 ProDoc) and CEO ER/portal:

Par. 63. Its status as a highly forested country presents Liberia with a challenge in terms of national land use planning and agricultural development policy that contributes to economic growth while avoiding loss of valuable forest ecosystems. Investors have shown an appetite for developing commercial agroforestry, but much of Liberia's available land is high conservation value (HCV) and high carbon stock (HCS) forest, and/or is claimed by local communities as their traditional land. This makes the granting of commercial concessions a fraught process in which concessionaires are allocated a large "area of interest," within which they must identify viable conversion areas in terms of economically practical spatial configuration, compliance with restrictions on natural forest conversion (e.g. under RSPO standards and principles), and respect for local community rights to land and resources. For example, this combination of challenges, combined with a decline in global prices for palm oil, led Sime Darby to relinquish its oil palm concession in Northwest Liberia at the end of 2019. Although the Government of Liberia continues to express commitment to environmental standards and protection of primary forest, there is a risk that this commitment may erode over time if these

standards continue to stymie agroforestry development in the absence of workable models.

6) Added to Section 2E (p. 15 ProDoc) and in CEO ER:

Par. 60. Liberia is one of the poorest countries in the world with a gross national income (GNI) per capita in 2017 of USD 620, using the World Bank's methodology. Liberia ranks 175th out of 189 countries on UNDP's Human Development Index (UNDP, 2018). More than half of the population (50.9%) lives below the national poverty line, with large geographical disparities in poverty; 85% of young people, who make up two-thirds of Liberia's population, are unemployed (World Bank, 2018). Limited employment opportunities and pervasive poverty result in heavy local community dependence on natural resources for subsistence and local commerce (shifting cultivation for subsistence agriculture, non-timber forest product (NTFP) collection, wood for energy and housing materials, bushmeat for food consumption and sale, etc.). The combination of these economic pressures and limited awareness of ecosystem function and value result in unsustainable extraction methods and levels, undermining the viability of forests in Northwest Liberia. As men and women in Liberia interact with their environment in different ways, this barrier manifests in different way with respect to resource use, needs and priorities depending on gender. In addition to driving unsustainable resource use, poverty contributes to wider social concerns in the country. Rural poverty in particular aggravates land and resource disputes, which can escalate to violent conflict. Within households, poverty contributes to domestic violence, and poverty in Liberia also makes people vulnerable to other risks such as human rights abuses, abusive labor practices, and violation of prohibitions against child labor. These factors present a challenging context for the pursuit of sustainable production models that adhere to environmental, social and governance safeguards.

UNDP (2018), "Human Development Reports - human development indicators - Liberia" (database), <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/LBR> (accessed Feb. 20, 2021).

World Bank (2018), Country Partnership Framework for the Republic of Liberia for the Period FY19-FY24, World Bank, Washington, DC, <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/374031541438293964/pdf/liberia-cpf-11012018-636768792698663889.pdf>.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) The existing institutional and regulatory framework, including the stakeholders dealing with land use and rights, food production and conservation is not presented in sufficient detail. Please supplement as needed so that we better understand the rationale of the proposed interventions and how they build on an existing baseline.

2) The GGP project is hardly referenced in the baseline section and where it is, it is done in a way that seemingly reflects a third party perspective, not one where the agency's own work is a major contributor to its goals and outputs. A clearer summary of what has been achieved by the GGP project in Liberia and what remains to be built upon through the FOLUR project, both in terms of the work at the landscape level and on policy, is necessary.

3) The work of IDH with Golden Veroleum Liberia (GVL) would seem highly relevant as part of the baseline and something to learn lessons from and build on but this isn't mentioned in the baseline section.

05/18/21

The comments have been addressed and the baseline is now far more robust. There is a clear elaboration on how the baseline scenario and associated baseline projects were derived.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

1) Added to Section 2F, starting p. 18 ProDoc and in the baseline section of CEO ER/portal

Par. 70. The current baseline scenario involves ongoing efforts of a broad array of stakeholders. Key actors relevant to the institutional and regulatory framework in the NW Liberia Landscape, relating in particular to land rights, conservation and food production, include:

Land rights

1. Government ? LLA: develop policies on a continuous basis, undertake actions and implement programs in support of land governance, including land administration and management in Liberia

2. NGO ? IDH: piloting land use planning in Lofa and conducting community awareness and sensitization the Liberian Land Rights Law particularly on land ownership in general and specifically on Customary Land and key questions related to Customary Land Right

3. NGO ? Landesa: addressing key land-related challenges with the aim of enhancing the tenure security of poor rural women and men in Liberia.

4. CBO ? FCI: Promoting Land rights, natural resource management and benefit sharing
5. CSO ? SDI: Promoting SDI's community rights and food security with good governance in forest and climate policy of Liberia.

2) Added to Section 2F, starting on p. 19 ProDoc and CEO ER in the portal:

Par. 74. GGP key achievements include:

? Functional coordination mechanisms at the landscape (NWOPLF) and national level (NOPPOL) platforms. However, these platforms still have some capacity gaps including inadequate human and financial resources to run these platforms to push the RSPO NI process. Through FOLUR, NWOPLF will be expanded to cover all the five counties in the NW Liberia landscape and capacity of NWOPLF management team built on organizational management, conflict resolution, fundraising and proposal writing etc.
? Draft national oil palm strategy and action plan developed. However, the GGP is coming to an end. Hence, FOLUR project will implement this strategy at the landscape level.

? Successfully piloted CAs in three communities for conservation of 5,000 ha of HCS/HCV forest, hence, FOLUR will scale this up to 50,000 ha of HCS/HCV forest in nine clans based on lessons learned from the pilot

? CI and UNDP supported the development of a regulation for Conservation Agreements with the FDA and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Partners envisage that the LCF will serve as a mechanism for channeling funds from a range of conservation finance sources, including biodiversity offsets from Liberia's growing mining and energy sectors, payments for ecosystem services such as prevention of deforestation (REDD+) transactions, foreign sources, and earmarked government revenues such as conservation fees levied on the timber sector. However, the regulations have not yet been ratified. So, through the policy work under FOLUR project, these regulations will be pushed forward for ratification.

? Various analysis tools developed under GGP project such as the Landscape Causality tool (LCAT), Participatory Landscape Forest Analysis Tool (PALFAT), Landscape Analysis Tool (LAT) will be used in the implementation of the FOLUR project
While on policy, there are several on-going policies being developed under the GGP that the FOLUR project will build on including:

? Land use policy being currently developed under the GGP project will contribute to the development of integrated land use plan for NW Liberia Landscape under FOLUR. This will substantially improve land use planning framework at the national level, supporting landscape approaches for land use planning and allowing for a more appropriate demarcation of forest land and protection of land that still has forest cover, and an improved monitoring of land use. This policy if successfully passed will allow

better land use planning and enforcement in the GGP landscape and a stronger legal framework to protect HCS/HCV forest areas.

? Conservation Agreement legalization being done by GGP Project where an analysis existing legislative gaps and linkages in relation to Conservation Agreements (CAs) as well as the identification of international best practices in CAs within production landscapes was produced, to inform the development of legal instruments related to CAs within production landscapes. A draft regulation was developed in consultation with the FDA and the EPA and finalization and gazettment is envisioned for Q1-Q2 2021. Once legalized, this will give a legal basis for the use of CAs in FOLUR project, and facilitate land use planning, conservation and community benefits in production landscapes. This will provide a stronger legal framework as well as sustainability to CA tool, ensuring protection of HCVF and supporting local development.

? Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) completed to inform policy and strategy with respect to commercial and smallholder oil palm plantation development, on the basis of economic modeling combined with geospatial analysis of land suitability. The GGP does not include next steps to implement this strategy; the FOLUR project investment will use TSA results to ground the strategy for approaching potential sources of financing for development of sustainable smallholder palm oil production.

3) Added to Baseline section on p. 18 ProDoc:

Par. 72. The IDH program of work in Liberia constitutes an important part of the baseline that informs the FOLUR project design, specifically on the development of stakeholder engagement plans, business plans and landscape management plans in cocoa and palm oil production areas. This includes lessons learned from IDH's work on formulating investment plans for community oil palm and other livelihood and conservation opportunities to unlock financing and facilitate scaling up of sustainable cocoa and palm oil production. In Lofa County, IDH worked with cocoa company Theobroma (ECOM) from 2018-2020 to pilot transformation of grassland to cocoa agroforestry, including forest protection and restoration with the local community. The FOLUR project also builds on IDH work with palm oil company Golden Veroleum Liberia (GVL) on community oil palm and green growth plans through mobilizing investment in community outgrowers. IDH worked with GVL outgrower communities and the FDA to set aside forests for conservation, and build community capacity in governance, land use planning, food security and income diversification, and forest management.

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

12/15/20

No. The integrated Landuse planning focus is useful and aligned with the FOLUR design. However, what is lacking is detail about specific actions to improve production practice to make them more sustainable, developing and taking steps to get in place supportive national policy, and bringing in supply chain actors that can provide incentives to move towards sustainability. All of these are core to the FOLUR design. Additional comments are below:

1) The scale and location of intervention is not clear in Component 1 and 2. Will the project intervene in all the NW Liberia region or will it target specific areas or localities and if so, how many? Please clarify.

2) The targeted production include food crops and NTFPs that are not targeted entry points of the FOLUR program. Please prioritize activities on Palm oil and Cocoa value chains and explain how these additional crops contribute to improved overall management of the landscape in order to justify their inclusion.

3) The creation of PAs is not aligned with the FOLUR program. If these areas are delineated as part of LUP process this is acceptable but FOLUR isn't a project focused on PA creation or management. The output 1.2.3 should be revised to clarify and reflect this.

4) In component 1, the multi-stakeholder coordination and engagement is unclear. The description focuses mainly on gathering information and building plans but the consideration of how all the involved stakeholders will be engaged together to implement an integrated landscape plan appears limited beyond the creation of a governance structure. The participating stakeholders should be named in the description. Please clarify and consider adding relevant outputs/outcome.

5) Component 2 is focused on the production/landscape level without clear outputs related to other actors along the value chain. Please state clearly other supply chain actors who will be engaged and what will be done along the value chain to promote sustainable production (including companies, financiers, traders, etc). More detailed information on the engagement with Mano would be useful here.

6) It is unclear how the increased resilience of men and women (outcome 2.1) contributes to the objective of the component 2 which is the Promotion of sustainable production. It should be a co-benefit of the project. Please revise accordingly.

7) It is unclear how output 2.3 will lead to desired results. There is little detail on the types of policy changes that will be sought and it would seem that achieving two changes in regulation lacks ambition for a project of this scale and scope. Was any analysis undertaken during the PPG about the existing gaps in policy necessary to create an enabling environment for sustainable production and bringing in additional

financing? Are there policy reform efforts undertaken under the GGP that can be built upon and moved further forward? Moreover, the approach of simply providing recommendations to government isn't too likely to generate desired results without follow up and significant support efforts. Please clarify and revise

8) The financial incentives are unclear. We don't see how concretely (with which activities) the project will provide market access and/or price premiums that will ensure the sustainable practices remain after the initial financing.

9) The financial plan is a critical element of the project and relies on the mobilization of \$10M from impact investments. Nevertheless, these resources don't seem to be secured for the project implementation at this stage as discussions with partners are still ongoing. In that context, please clarify when the financial plan will be in place and in case the total amount can't be mobilized, what would be the expected impact on the project results.

10) We don't clearly understand the criteria for the selection of the stakeholders and the intervention sites (for improved agriculture practices and restoration). Please clarify.

11) The activities of developing 'the basis for a policy proposal' doesn't seem to be enough to achieve the output 3.2.1 'policies on performance payments and Payment for Ecosystems Services schemes developed and/or adopted'. Please explain.

12) The FOLUR Global platform is only mentioned in its potential to support the financing of restoration. Is this based on any discussions with or commitments from Global Platform partners? In any case, the work with the FOLUR Global Platform needs to be considered and more clearly developed.

05/18/21

1) Project documents are now clear that interventions will target NW Landscape.
Cleared

2) The alternative livelihood approach to forest conservation associated with NTFPs has been explained. Cleared

3) The justification for the gazettement activities in support of ecosystem services in the broader landscape has been explained. Cleared

4) Key actors have been identified. Cleared

5) Linkages to actors along the supply chain more clearly identified. Cleared

6) It's clear how the increased resilience of men and women contributes to the objective.
Cleared

7) Approach to improving policy and strengthening government capacity has been clarified. Cleared

8) It is understood that the project will build on the legal/policy basis for dedicating sustainable financing to Community Agreement maintenance and smallholder finance and will take steps to strengthen capacity to support the flow of financing. Cleared.

9 Financial aspects have been clarified in the Prodoc. We suggest copying the entire description of 2.3.1 (p. 117) from the Prodoc into the corresponding section of the CER portal upload.

10) Section 6 of the CEO portal upload on Global environmental benefits explains the site prioritization process. It may be useful if the explanation provided in that section is moved up so that site selection process is understood as part of the alternative scenario where it is more relevant.

11) The explanation of how the project will implement performance-based payments linked to restoration efforts as a PES approach for habitat restoration is sufficient. Cleared

12)Explanation of the linkages that will be made to the global project has been improved. Cleared.

06/28/21

All comments have been sufficiently addressed. The proposed alternative scenario as described is sound and adequate.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

9) financial aspects included in the CEO ER/portal

10) Geographic scope/site selection now included in the CEO ER/portal.

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

Added to Section 2G (p. 22 ProDoc) and in the CEO ER :

Par. 81 (ProDoc). Specific actions to improve production practices of palm oil and cocoa to make them more sustainable can include:

- ? Improving access of smallholder cocoa and palm oil farmers to high quality cocoa and palm oil seeds by linking them to seed suppliers and private sector such as MANO for palm oil and Theobroma for cocoa.
- ? Establish VSLAs and cooperatives to improve farmers' access to credit
- ? Training of farmers on good agronomic and agroforestry practices.
- ? Demonstration and promotion of climate smart agricultural practices
- ? Crop suitability analysis for cocoa and palm oil will be conducted
- ? Promote alternative livelihoods such as vegetable production, rice, cassava, NTFPs etc.
- ? Development of credible certification programme for NW Liberia Landscape cocoa and palm oil
- ? Strengthening existing cooperatives for activities such as extension, training, seeds and nursery, pre- and post- harvest technologies, and other agricultural products processing and marketing

This entails working with actors at various points in the supply chain, most notably farmer cooperatives and farmers themselves (e.g., building on IDH work with farmers and communities on land rights and sustainable cocoa and palm production, and CI work on community-based land use planning and conservation incentives), finance for smallholder development (e.g., the &green Fund, Althelia, and the LDN Fund), and the region's large-scale commercial plantation and mill operator (Mano Palm Oil Industries).

Par. 82. A number of key policies exist that could potentially incentivize and promote enterprise and investments in sustainable cocoa and palm oil production including the Liberia Agricultural Transformation Agenda (LATA), The Cocoa and Oil palm export strategies by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and the International Trade Centre (2014), and the Investment Promotion Strategy by the National Investment Commission (2013). Thus, the alternative scenario includes a review of legal context and policy incentive options on land use and promotion of climate-smart agriculture and responsibly produced palm oil and cocoa, to generate policy recommendations to support sustainable cocoa and palm oil production. For these recommendations to have an impact, the alternative scenario must include strengthening institutional capacities of key government agencies and ministries to effectively carry out their respective mandates, and coordination. Key entities to target include:

- ? The Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), for it to provide climate smart agricultural extension and advisory services to farmers
- ? Liberia Agricultural Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), enacted by national law to improve the regulatory environment for trade
- ? The Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) established with the mandate of training and certifying cooperatives

? The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with the mandate of guiding Liberia towards compliance with national and international environmental laws
? Forestry Development Authority as a custodian of the protected areas network and other forested lands in Liberia

1) Explanation starting on p. 7 ProDoc and CEO ER adjusted to read:

Par. 36. The key areas to prioritize for conservation in the land-use planning process will be existing protected areas, the proposed protected areas of Foya, Wologizi, Wonegizi and Kpo mountains, and communities neighboring these areas. The project will include contribute to development of a gazettelement package for the establishment of the Wologizi Protected Area (about 99,538 ha), and catalyze community restoration and conservation management, including a focus on conservation areas within designated Community Forests. Field interventions under Components 1 and 2 of the project will focus on 9 communities (clans) in the Northwest Liberia landscape (see Fig. 2 below). Within the framework of negotiated Conservation Agreements with each of these clans, the project will work with these communities on participatory land use planning, restoration, and participation in palm oil and cocoa commodity supply chains. Project activities will be undertaken in areas as indicated in Figure 2 through Conservation Agreements (CAs) with the nine clans will be as follows: four CAs focused on direct restoration (in Lofa County, Lower Guma clan in Vahun District; in Grand Cape Mount County, Seimavula clan in Porkpa District and Passawe and Fahnbulleh clans in Tewor District); two CAs for direct restoration and conservation through development and implementation of community land use plans (in Lofa County, Zeyeama clan in ZorZor District and Bondi clan in Voinjama District); and three CAs focused on conservation through development of community land use plans (in Gbarpolu County, Jawajeh and Zuie clans in Kongba District; in Grand Cape Mount County, Sokpo clan in Porkpa District). These sites were selected in a stakeholder workshop that convened 32 partners from government, private sector, civil society, and NGOs. The land areas of these communities average just under 30,000 ha, for a total of 268,605 ha. The land use planning processes to be conducted with each clan will seek to identify a total target of 15,000 ha for restoration efforts. In addition to the field interventions, the project will support multi-stakeholder land use planning at the Northwest Liberia regional level (in which community-level land use planning results will be important inputs).

2) Output and description revised to read as follows (p. 30 ProDoc) and in CEO ER:

Output 2.1.1: Capacity of male and female farmers, small-medium enterprise service providers, government, universities, and civil society, and organizational staff built on climate-smart agricultural practices and non-timber forest products (NTFP) practices with a focus on palm oil and cocoa value chains

Par. 107. The project will conduct a wide-reaching awareness and training program to expose stakeholders throughout the landscape to climate-smart agricultural alternatives, prioritizing palm oil and cocoa value chains and, in response to community priorities, also addressing NTFP opportunities. This package of practices will emphasize livelihood options that do not rely on continual forest conversion, but instead benefit from the presence of healthy forest ecosystems. (In addition to livelihood diversification, emphasis on NTFPs helps strengthen the case for forest conservation and restoration activities). This campaign will reach at least 10,000 beneficiaries; recognizing that exposure does not result in 100% of beneficiaries immediately changing behavior, this size audience will ensure an initial critical mass of early adopters. Producers will be trained on farming as a business, post-harvest handling, and market information systems. The content of this capacity-building program will be developed by contracted subject-matter experts working with FDA, the Ministry of Agriculture, EPA and civil society organizations to also generate institutional capacity growth.

3) Output and description revised to read as follows (p. 30 ProDoc) and in CEO ER in the portal:

Output 2.1.1: Capacity of male and female farmers, small-medium enterprise service providers, government, universities, and civil society, and organizational staff built on climate-smart agricultural practices and non-timber forest products (NTFP) practices with a focus on palm oil and cocoa value chains

Par 107 (ProDoc). The project will conduct a wide-reaching awareness and training program to expose stakeholders throughout the landscape to climate-smart agricultural alternatives, prioritizing palm oil and cocoa value chains and, in response to community priorities, also addressing NTFP opportunities. This package of practices will emphasize livelihood options that do not rely on continual forest conversion, but instead benefit from the presence of healthy forest ecosystems. (In addition to livelihood diversification, emphasis on NTFPs helps strengthen the case for forest conservation and restoration activities). This campaign will reach at least 10,000 beneficiaries; recognizing that exposure does not result in 100% of beneficiaries immediately changing behavior, this size audience will ensure an initial critical mass of early adopters. Producers will be trained on farming as a business, post-harvest handling, and market information systems. The content of this capacity-building program will be developed by contracted subject-matter experts working with FDA, the Ministry of Agriculture, EPA and civil society organizations to also generate institutional capacity growth.

4) Added to Output 1.3.1 description on p. 28 ProDoc and CEO ER:

Par. 100. Under the GGP project, a multi-stakeholder landscape forum - North West Oil Palm Landscape Forum (NWOPLF) was established covering two counties of Bomi and

Grand Cape Mount. NWOPLF was composed of several stakeholders including Government (MoA, FDA, MiA, and NBC), NGOs (CI Liberia), the Private sector (Sime Darby Plantation Liberia) and CSOs in both Counties. Based on the successes and lessons learned from NWOPLF, this project will strengthen the NWOPLF to cover all five Counties in the NW Liberia Landscape (Lofa, Bong, Bomi, Gbarpolu, and Grand Cape Mount). The composition of the NWOPLF will also be increased to include additional stakeholders as below:

? Government: MoA, LLA, FDA, MiA, NBC, MoGCSP, Ministry of Mines and Energy, LACRA, CDA

? NGOs: CI Liberia, SCNL, FFI, RSPB, IDH and Solidaridad

? Private sector: MPOI, Theobroma, Liberation Chocolate, Greentech, Intofawar Cooperative, Trade Link, Gbahlay Farmers Cooperative, Wienco, Liberia Agriculture and Asset Development Company (LAADCO), Nanorni oil palm cooperatives, Maliando cocoa cooperative, Ntorfawar cooperatives, Foya rural women cooperative, Vainga Agriculture Development and Management Consultancy (VADEMCO) etc.

? CSOs: Foundation for Community Initiative (FCI), SDI, SADS, Forest cry, FACE, Grand Cape Mount Civil Society Organizations, SAMFU etc.

? Academia: University of Liberia, Forestry Training Institute

Par. 101. The updated Terms of Reference to be developed for the expanded NWOPLF will define roles and responsibilities for the members with respect to land use planning processes and landscape governance for sustainability. At a minimum, it is anticipated that a NWOPLF Executive Committee will hold quarterly coordination meetings to guide land use planning processes and provide input into deployment of project field activities. It is envisioned that a set of technical working groups will provide specific substantive inputs for various aspects of project processes, such as mapping and spatial prioritization; policy alignment; landscape-level investment coordination; and communications/dissemination.

5) Added to Mano role description on p. 70 ProDoc and in CEO ER in the portal:

The relationship with Mano will be central to the success of the project. The MPOI concession is the single-largest land holding in Northwest Liberia, and thus occupies an outsized role in land use planning processes. As a potential purchaser of large volumes of oil palm fruit, it is also one of the largest economic actors in the landscape (MPOI has indicated that they intend to prioritize purchases from smallholders over expansion of its own managed commercial plantation area). Although the full strategy for engagement with Mano will be developed within the overall Private Sector Engagement Strategy in year one of the project, we can anticipate several key elements:

i. The EPA will engage MPOI to facilitate compliance with all Liberian environmental regulatory requirements. The transition of the concession from Sime Darby to MPOI left a small number of regulatory issues unresolved; these will be addressed as a precondition for further work (at the time of this submission, the EPA and MPOI have formally agreed on all the required steps).

ii. CI will work with MPOI specifically on the further refinement of corporate policies with respect to environmental sustainability and community engagement. (CI already has secured co-financing to support this work). When it took over the concession, MPOI adopted general Sime Darby policies and principles, which conform to RSPO requirements; MPOI itself is in the process of securing RSPO membership. CI's work will involve not only helping MPOI refine its policies and processes, but also support training of management and technical staff so as to embed sustainability principles and practices in the company's corporate culture and identity.

iii. In Land-use Planning processes with communities in and around the MPOI concession, MPOI will be engaged to participate so as to inform consideration of prospects and options for community-based smallholder oil palm development. This includes technical input as well as discussion of market opportunities, with an emphasis on logistical requirements for getting smallholder produce to the mill within the 24-hour window before spoilage.

iv. The project will work closely with MPOI to develop an investment prospectus for approaching potential impact investment sources, including &Green and Althelia. Company input into formulation of the business case will be valuable, as will corporate commitments including technical assistance and preferential purchasing, based on smallholder and community conformity with environmental and social standards.

Theobroma, a Dutch cocoa company, is also working with IDH to implement an agroforestry cocoa project in to restore tree cover to the grasslands in Foya. The project involves the cultivation of 40 hectares of cocoa intercropped with fruit trees, timber trees, plantain and pigeon peas. The idea is to limit the effects of bushfires during the dry season, and provide sustainable income and food security for the population of the area. The partners are now exploring the possibility of expanding the project.

Other private sector actors include Liberation Chocolate, Greentech, Intofawar Cooperative, Trade Link, Gbahlay Farmers Cooperative, Wienco

Other value chains actors include:

Liberia Agriculture and Asset Development Company (LAADCO) - Cocoa buyer

Nanorni oil palm cooperatives - Oil palm production, cattle introduction

Maliando cocoa cooperative - Buy products (rice, coffee, cocoa), cattle, support to farmers

Ntorfawor cooperatives - Buy products (rice, coffee, cocoa), cattle, support to farmers

Manni rice farmers cooperative - Buy rice and support farmers

Foya rural women cooperative - Poultry and oil palm nursery production

Vainga Agriculture Development and Management Consultancy (VADEMCO) -

Training of small scale cocoa farmers in basic modern cocoa production, pest management and control, as well as, cocoa intensification, among others.

6) Outcome 2.1 revised (per above)

7) Output 2.2.1 description revised/expanded as follows (starting on p. 32 ProDoc):

Output 2.2.1: Policy recommendations to support sustainable agriculture by men and women developed and provided to government

Par. 113. Building on lessons derived from demonstrations of practices and facilitation of incentives for sustainable agricultural production, the project will develop at least two policy recommendations for new regulations that support such production. Feasible and impactful areas for such regulatory recommendations will be identified over the course of execution but may be expected to include reinforcement of the linkages between sustainable agriculture and land-use planning, and between sustainable agriculture and maintenance of natural capital. Current policies on agriculture will be reviewed to ensure that sustainable production issues faced by women in NW Liberia landscape are addressed and incorporated in the five County Development plans, and/or National development plans and policies. All policy work will be conducted in collaboration with the relevant stakeholders including those in Government charged with the implementation and monitoring of these policies.

Par. 114. Priorities for policy work will be determined together with other stakeholders, through the NWOPLF. Building on GGP work, priorities for consideration include:

? Passage of land use policy developed under the GGP project to improve the land use planning framework at the national level, support landscape approaches for land use planning and allow more appropriate demarcation of forest land and protection of land that still has forest cover, and improve monitoring of land use.

? Build on Conservation Agreement legislation drafted under the GGP project, to reinforce the legal basis for use of CAs to facilitate land use planning, conservation and community benefits in production landscapes, and strengthen the legal basis for dedicating national sustainable financing mechanisms to CA maintenance.

? Build on policy recommendations informed by the GGP's Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) with respect to commercial and smallholder oil palm plantation development, notably on financing for development of sustainable smallholder palm oil production.

Par. 115. To enhance the likelihood that policy work will have concrete impact, the project will include strengthening institutional capacities of key government agencies and ministries to effectively carry out their respective mandates, and coordination. Key entities to target include:

? The Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), for it to provide climate smart agricultural extension and advisory services to farmers

? Liberia Agricultural Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), enacted by national law to improve the regulatory environment for trade

? The Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) established with the mandate of training and certifying cooperatives

? The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with the mandate of guiding Liberia towards compliance with national and international environmental laws

? Forestry Development Authority as a custodian of the protected areas network and other forested lands in Liberia

8) ? Build on Conservation Agreement legislation drafted under the GGP project, to reinforce the legal basis for use of CAs to facilitate land use planning, conservation and community benefits in production landscapes, and strengthen the legal basis for dedicating national sustainable financing mechanisms to CA maintenance.

? Build on policy recommendations informed by the GGP's Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) with respect to commercial and smallholder oil palm plantation development, notably on financing for development of sustainable smallholder palm oil production.

Par. 115. To enhance the likelihood that policy work will have concrete impact, the project will include strengthening institutional capacities of key government agencies and ministries to effectively carry out their respective mandates, and coordination. Key entities to target include:

? The Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), for it to provide climate smart agricultural extension and advisory services to farmers

? Liberia Agricultural Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), enacted by national law to improve the regulatory environment for trade

? The Cooperative Development Agency (CDA) established with the mandate of training and certifying cooperatives

? The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), with the mandate of guiding Liberia towards compliance with national and international environmental laws

? Forestry Development Authority as a custodian of the protected areas network and other forested lands in Liberia

9) Description of Output 2.3.1 expanded to read (starting on p. 33):

Par. 117. Currently there are a number of initiatives in the Northwest Liberia Landscape with bearing on financing solutions, but these initiatives are not coordinated or aligned. This suggests that there may be missed opportunities for synergies, either in fundraising and financing solutions or in cost-sharing and implementation efficiencies. Therefore a holistic, integrative Financial Plan will be developed during project implementation. The Northwest Liberia land-use plan will provide the basis for identifying such synergies and developing a financial plan for integrated land-use management across the landscape. A critical element of this financial plan will be alignment and coordination of government resources, such that these resources collectively are rationalized within the framework of the land-use plan. The Financial Plan will build on the TSA prepared under the GGP to include an investment prospectus for impact investors, non-grant instruments from development institutions, and conventional investment sources. TSA results indicate that the economics of investment in smallholder oil palm development benefit government, communities and the private sector, while maintaining valuable natural capital, suggesting good prospects for securing investment over the project period. In the event that the target amount is not secured within the project period, key stakeholders (CI, FFI, IDH) are committed to continued work with the Government of

Liberia on efforts to secure investors, while direct project impacts are sustained through market relationships built between smallholders in the landscape and other supply chain participants.

10) Description of Output 2.3.1 expanded to read (starting on p. 33):

Par. 117. Currently there are a number of initiatives in the Northwest Liberia Landscape with bearing on financing solutions, but these initiatives are not coordinated or aligned. This suggests that there may be missed opportunities for synergies, either in fundraising and financing solutions or in cost-sharing and implementation efficiencies. Therefore a holistic, integrative Financial Plan will be developed during project implementation. The Northwest Liberia land-use plan will provide the basis for identifying such synergies and developing a financial plan for integrated land-use management across the landscape. A critical element of this financial plan will be alignment and coordination of government resources, such that these resources collectively are rationalized within the framework of the land-use plan. The Financial Plan will build on the TSA prepared under the GGP to include an investment prospectus for impact investors, non-grant instruments from development institutions, and conventional investment sources. TSA results indicate that the economics of investment in smallholder oil palm development benefit government, communities and the private sector, while maintaining valuable natural capital, suggesting good prospects for securing investment over the project period. In the event that the target amount is not secured within the project period, key stakeholders (CI, FFI, IDH) are committed to continued work with the Government of Liberia on efforts to secure investors, while direct project impacts are sustained through market relationships built between smallholders in the landscape and other supply chain participants.

Added to ProDoc (p. 7):

Par. 35. Project sites were selected based on spatial analysis and the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). The analysis covered geographic, economic, and social aspects of the NW Liberia landscape, to help prioritize target areas for the project and optimize the impacts of interventions for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation using four main criteria: (a) value for conservation, (b) vulnerability to forest degradation, (c) vulnerability to deforestation, and (d) viability for intervention. Spatial data layers were created for the first three criteria, and for the fourth criterion, a qualitative assessment of the conditions for implementing project interventions was used and included assessing the strength of the governance and regulatory mechanisms that are associated with the dominant land uses in NW Liberia and the capacity of the decision-making institutions associated with those land use. By combining spatial layers into a single score, the places with the highest conservation value forest and the greatest vulnerability were identified. The table below details the indicators used. A stakeholder workshop that convened 32 partners from government, private sector, civil society, and NGOs was held to validate the proposed project sites.

In addition, project sites for improved agriculture were selected based on desktop research on crop, soil and climate suitability analyses. The main sources cited included: CAAS. 2007. Tree Crops Sub-sector Report. Comprehensive Assessment of the Agricultural Sector in Liberia. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), World Bank, Monrovia, pp 69-139.

LISGIS (Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services). 2012. Agriculture and Crop Survey 2012. Monrovia.

Republic of Liberia. 2012. National Export Strategy - Cocoa Export Strategy 2014-2018. Republic of Liberia and International Trade Centre, Monrovia and Geneva.

Schroth G, Läderach P, Martínez-Valle AI, Bunn C. 2015. Climate vulnerability and adaptation of the smallholder cocoa and coffee value chains in Liberia. Working Paper No. 134. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS); International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). Copenhagen, Denmark. Available online at: www.ccafs.cgiar.org

11) Added to Output 3.2.1 description (p. 35 ProDoc):

To do so, the project will implement performance-based payments linked to restoration efforts, demonstrating how PES can be deployed for habitat restoration to enhance protection of HCS/HCV areas (i.e. to reinforce REDD+ interventions); this will provide the basis for explicit recognition of restoration as an eligible activity in relevant government policy (e.g., in updated NDCs and other climate change policy instruments).

12) FOLUR Global Platform linkages are referenced throughout the ProDoc, and now expanded in places. Some examples below:

On p. 36 ProDoc:

Par. 129. The project will also engage with regional platforms and initiatives focusing on cocoa and palm oil value chains (e.g., African Palm Oil Initiative, African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative (AFR100), and West Africa Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance (WACSAA) through South-South cooperation and exchange visits with other FOLUR beneficiary countries in West Africa (Ivory Coast, Ghana, and Guinea). At the Global level, the project will engage with various bodies such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA) and Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), Global Landscape Forum (GLF), the One Planet network (10YFP) Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) Programme, World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), UNDP Green Commodities Programme, and FOLUR-specific collaboration mechanisms that will be established.

On p. 54 ProDoc:

Par. 194. Finally, the project's effective demonstrations of integrated landscape management and land-use planning linked to sustainable commodity production will

also serve as models for replication elsewhere in West Africa and beyond. This potential for wider replication motivates the project's substantial commitment to national, regional, and global knowledge sharing. For example, CI Liberia already is in contact with the FAO-led process to develop a FOLUR project focused on palm oil in Guinea. Participation in learning exchange and dissemination through the FOLUR Global Platform will be part of a conscious effort to facilitate regional and wider replication. The model and implementation processes in Liberia may be of most immediate relevance to comparable regional smallholder contexts (such as Guinea), but the FOLUR Global Platform combined with CI's global presence and expertise also will allow the project partners to contribute to adaptation of learnings to other contexts.

On p. 61 ProDoc:

Par. 202. In addition, there will be numerous opportunities for sharing lessons learned within the landscape, at the national level and among FOLUR IP Child Projects that face similar challenges, particularly at the regional and global levels. This will create significant opportunities for South-South cooperation. Success stories will figure prominently among the lessons being shared, with the goal of ensuring extensive within- and between-Child Projects uptake and replication. Regular documentation of success stories and lessons will facilitate sharing with the Global Platform, for onward communication to other Child Projects and wider audiences. Together with the FOLUR Global Platform, opportunities will also be identified and pursued for exchanges with other Child Projects and other GCP and GEF commodity projects in order to maximize institutional learning and dissemination in key technical areas related to the cocoa and palm oil production-deforestation nexus.

On p. 61 ProDoc:

Par. 203. The proposed project team, in close co-operation with the adaptive management and learning team, will engage regularly with external partners, and participate at key events to disseminate information through media coverage, publications and presentations, all of which will facilitate South-South learning. Working with the FOLUR Global Platform, the Project will organize South-South exchanges in co-operation with other Child Projects to enable practitioners to learn from each other's experiences, thereby facilitating learning especially through the Global Landscapes Forum (GLF), Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR) and the Global Restoration Council that support the Bonn Challenge. Work with the GLF ? a Core Partner within the FOLUR Global Platform ? will be particularly helpful to the Project given the Forum's expertise and role with respect to communications, outreach and events; for example, intended GLF-organized annual regional gatherings focused on cocoa on West Africa are especially pertinent to the Project.

On p.62 ProDoc:

Par. 205. There will also be significant stakeholder engagement with leaders from e.g. industry, civil society and government, to secure buy-in for the Project. The proposed

project will work with industry initiatives, such as the High Carbon Stock Approach Group, the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil and the World Cocoa Foundation, and environmental and social organizations to ensure alignment and support. Importantly, the Project will coordinate engagement efforts with commodity platforms and roundtables with the FOLUR Global Platform, to streamline efforts and ensure a consistent global approach. Working with the Platform, the Project will seek to position Liberia as a model of sustainability for heavily forested countries globally. We can leverage the growing experience of organizations across Liberia that are piloting innovative approaches, as well as build on private sector partnerships with companies interested in shaping their investments to promote sustainable development.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

Yes, elaboration on how the project is aligned with impact program strategies is sufficient.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

No. The incremental reasoning is not clearly described. Please address the following:

1) Beyond the general focus on integrated landscape management planning including restoration and cooperatives, there are no details of what activities the project will support concretely and how they will build on and complete the existing baseline. In particular, all the possible synergies with the GGP should be considered.

2) There is no information on ?Expected contributions from the GEFTF, LDCF and SCCF?. The text only says they were unchanged. As this project is a child developed under a program, there is no PIF and the CEO ER needs to be fully developed.

05/18/21

A better description of incremental reasoning and their contribution to the baseline has been provided. How the co-financing will also contribute, however, is still missing.

06/28/21

How the co-financing will contribute will contribute to project outcomes has been explained. The incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing have been clearly elaborated.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

Description of co-financing included.

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

1) Incremental cost section expanded with the following (ProDoc and CEO ER in the portal):

Par. 149 (ProDoc. As indicated previously, several aspects of the GGP are key elements of the baseline upon which the project will build. These constitute incremental costs which, if not undertaken, would limit the long-term impact of the GGP. Specific elements include:

? Functional coordination mechanisms at the landscape (NWOPLF) and national level (NOPPOL) platforms. However, these platforms still have some capacity gaps including inadequate human and financial resources to run these platforms to push the RSPO NI process. Through FOLUR, NWOPLF will be expanded to cover all five counties in the NW Liberia landscape and capacity of NWOPLF management team built on organizational management, conflict resolution, fundraising and proposal writing etc.

? Draft national oil palm strategy and action plan developed. However, the GGP is coming to an end, without provisions for implementation of the strategy. Hence, FOLUR project will implement this strategy at the landscape level, and generate momentum for national implementation.

? Successfully piloted CAs in three communities for conservation of 5,000 ha of HCS/HCV forest. This GGP achievement represents an important demonstration of using CAs in a productive landscape, but does not have provisions for replication and

scale up. The FOLUR project will scale this up to 50,000 ha of HCS/HCV forest in nine clans, based on lessons learned from the GGP pilot.

? CI and UNDP supported the development of a regulation for Conservation Agreements with the FDA and EPA. Partners envisage that the LCF will serve as a mechanism for channeling funds from a range of conservation finance sources, including biodiversity offsets from Liberia's growing mining and energy sectors, payments for ecosystem services such as REDD+ transactions, foreign sources, and earmarked government revenues such as conservation fees levied on the timber sector. However, the regulations have not yet been ratified. Through policy work under the FOLUR project, these regulations will be pushed forward for ratification.

? Various analysis tools developed under GGP project such as the Landscape Causality Tool (LCAT), Participatory Landscape Forest Analysis Tool (PALFAT), Landscape Analysis Tool (LAT) will be used in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the FOLUR project. This incremental cost will support application of these tools to a significantly larger landscape, thereby catalyzing replication, scale-up and mainstreaming among government and other stakeholders.

? Targeted Scenario Analysis (TSA) completed to inform policy and strategy with respect to commercial and smallholder oil palm plantation development, on the basis of economic modeling combined with geospatial analysis of land suitability. The GGP does not include next steps to implement this strategy; the FOLUR project investment will use TSA results to ground the strategy for approaching potential sources of financing for development of sustainable smallholder palm oil production.

2) expected contributions from GEFTF and co-financing now included in the CEO ER/portal

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) The presentation of the benefits is described in too generic terms. What does it mean that the restoration of 265,000 ha of degraded agricultural land, ensuring sustainable management in 950,000 ha mosaic of land uses, improving management on 650,000 ha and preventing the loss of 876,066 ha of high conservation value forest? Please clarify the respective land-uses and the expected improvements anticipated as a result of the project in terms of restoration and biodiversity.

2) There are very ambitious expectations in terms of results, particularly the avoided deforestation area, which is very large. How the targets have been assessed (methodology used and references) and what exactly is the rationale behind the indirect benefits are unclear

3) The Rio Marker for climate change adaptation is noted as 'one' or 'significant' but despite this there is no mention of adaptation benefits. This marker is to be used when a) the climate change adaptation objective is explicitly indicated in the activity documentation; and b) the activity contains specific measures targeting the definition above. Please review and revise accordingly.

05/18/21

The benefits have been clarified including the highlighting Climate Change adaptation activities to be undertaken by the project. There is further elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

1) The concept included direct and indirect benefits in terms of hectares. The rationale behind the inclusion initially of indirect targets was to attempt to estimate the contribution of other partners and stakeholders. However, because of the difficulty in collecting this data and monitoring these targets, the team decided to remove the indirect targets and focus only on the direct targets which are under the control of the project. (see also next comment)

Section 3D was adjusted to include (p. 42 ProDoc) and the GEB section in the CEO ER/portal:

Par. 151 (ProDoc). This project will contribute to maintaining globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services by improving land use practices over 350,000 ha as below:

? Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity: 100,000 ha

? Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems: 200,000 ha

? Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided: 50,000 ha

2) The concept included direct and indirect benefits in terms of hectares. The rationale behind the inclusion initially of indirect targets was to attempt to estimate the

contribution of other partners and stakeholders. However, because of the difficulty in collecting this data and monitoring these targets, the team decided to remove the indirect targets and focus only on the direct targets which are under the control of the project.

Added to Section 3D (p. 42 ProDoc) and in the core indicators section of portal

To maximize biodiversity benefits, targets and sites were selected based on the following:

- i. Only those areas crucial in ensuring ecosystem integrity and connectivity were selected using spatial analysis (GIS) and the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). The analysis covered geographic, economic, and social aspects of the NW Liberia landscape, to help prioritize target areas for the project and optimize the impacts of interventions for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation using four main criteria: (a) value for conservation, (b) vulnerability to forest degradation, (c) vulnerability to deforestation, and (d) viability for intervention. Spatial data layers were created for the first three criteria, and for the fourth criterion, a qualitative assessment of the conditions for implementing project interventions was used and included assessing the strength of the governance and regulatory mechanisms that are associated with the dominant land uses in NW Liberia and the capacity of the decision-making institutions associated with those land use. By combining spatial layers into a single score, the sites with the highest conservation value forest and the greatest vulnerability were identified.
- ii. The total HCVF area that is outside of the formal protected areas is 246,007 ha. So, through the project, conservation agreements will be signed with communities to with nine clans to conserve 50,000 ha of HCVF areas outside formal protection. This 50,000 ha was determined using GIS as the area of land under the jurisdictions of the nine selected clans
- iii. Costs per hectare. A study done in 2011 by FDA and UNDP that showed that the cost per hectare for Sustainable forest management is US\$ 2.50., and the cost per hectare for Afforestation and Reforestation is USD\$150.00 (Kantor and UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Investment and Financial Flows for mitigation in the forestry sector in Liberia).
- iv. A stakeholder workshop was conducted where the results of this analysis were validated.

3) Text added to CEO ER and the ProDoc:

To maximize biodiversity benefits, targets and sites were selected based on the following:

i. Only those areas crucial in ensuring ecosystem integrity and connectivity were selected using spatial analysis (GIS) and the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). The analysis covered geographic, economic, and social aspects of the NW Liberia landscape, to help prioritize target areas for the project and optimize the impacts of interventions for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation using four main criteria: (a) value for conservation, (b) vulnerability to forest degradation, (c) vulnerability to deforestation, and (d) viability for intervention. Spatial data layers were created for the first three criteria, and for the fourth criterion, a qualitative assessment of the conditions for implementing project interventions was used and included assessing the strength of the governance and regulatory mechanisms that are associated with the dominant land uses in NW Liberia and the capacity of the decision-making institutions associated with those land use. By combining spatial layers into a single score, the sites with the highest conservation value forest and the greatest vulnerability were identified.

ii. The total HCVF area that is outside of the formal protected areas is 246,007 ha. So, through the project, conservation agreements will be signed with communities to with nine clans to conserve 50,000 ha of HCVF areas outside formal protection. This 50,000 ha was determined using GIS as the area of land under the jurisdictions of the nine selected clans

iii. Costs per hectare. A study done in 2011 by FDA and UNDP that showed that the cost per hectare for Sustainable forest management is US\$ 2.50., and the cost per hectare for Afforestation and Reforestation is USD\$150.00 (Kantor and UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Investment and Financial Flows for mitigation in the forestry sector in Liberia).

iv. A stakeholder workshop was conducted where the results of this analysis were validated.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) The component description discusses the potential to generate innovative financing through &Green and Athelia. Such innovative arrangements should be mentioned here if they are an important part of the approach.

2) The description of the project's potential for sustainability and scaling from small holders to the global level is lacking and requires a more thoughtful analysis. In regard

to this, the potential for replication of a model generated for other parts of W. Africa is well aligned with the FOLUR design and should be further developed.

05/18/21

The description of the project's innovation, sustainability, and potential for scaling have been much improved.

Cleared.

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

1) Innovativeness section

To maximize biodiversity benefits, targets and sites were selected based on the following:

- i. Only those areas crucial in ensuring ecosystem integrity and connectivity were selected using spatial analysis (GIS) and the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM). The analysis covered geographic, economic, and social aspects of the NW Liberia landscape, to help prioritize target areas for the project and optimize the impacts of interventions for addressing drivers of deforestation and forest degradation using four main criteria: (a) value for conservation, (b) vulnerability to forest degradation, (c) vulnerability to deforestation, and (d) viability for intervention. Spatial data layers were created for the first three criteria, and for the fourth criterion, a qualitative assessment of the conditions for implementing project interventions was used and included assessing the strength of the governance and regulatory mechanisms that are associated with the dominant land uses in NW Liberia and the capacity of the decision-making institutions associated with those land use. By combining spatial layers into a single score, the sites with the highest conservation value forest and the greatest vulnerability were identified.
- ii. The total HCVF area that is outside of the formal protected areas is 246,007 ha. So, through the project, conservation agreements will be signed with communities to with nine clans to conserve 50,000 ha of HCVF areas outside formal protection. This 50,000 ha was determined using GIS as the area of land under the jurisdictions of the nine selected clans
- iii. Costs per hectare. A study done in 2011 by FDA and UNDP that showed that the cost per hectare for Sustainable forest management is US\$ 2.50., and the cost per hectare for Afforestation and Reforestation is USD\$150.00 (Kantor and UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Investment and Financial Flows for mitigation in the forestry sector in Liberia).

iv. A stakeholder workshop was conducted where the results of this analysis were validated.

2) Replicability and Scale Up Section revised

The combination of multi-stakeholder, multi-level land-use planning, investment in sustainable agriculture and agroforestry, and conservation of natural capital offers great potential for replicability and scaling up. The project will develop the foundation for integrated landscape management in Liberia; the coarse national land-use map that will be developed will provide the basis for replicating the overall project in other landscapes in the country. The suite of investments in sustainable smallholder production likewise will be replicable elsewhere in the country, while offering a solution for commercial agroforestry concessionaires. The planning processes and governance mechanisms to be designed and applied in Northwest Liberia will provide models for improved planning and decision-making in other landscapes and thus for an ever-greater portion of the country's natural capital.

The main form of scale up will be the involvement of growing numbers of smallholders in sustainable supply chains for palm oil and cocoa. Initially, this will be achieved through replication in Northwest Liberia, and then other parts of the country, as NGOs, civil society and relevant government agencies gain experience with the model, processes, and production techniques. Importantly, proof of concept and demonstration of ability to repay will open the door to additional financing. Replication and scale-up of links between smallholders in Liberia and global markets for sustainably produced, deforestation-free commodities will benefit from economies of scale; these economies of scale relate to increasing returns to investment in monitoring and certification systems, chain of custody systems, and marketing and transaction infrastructure as more producers participate throughout Liberia.

Successes of Conservation Agreements to date and the additional Conservation Agreements to be implemented in Northwest Liberia under this project will inform continued efforts to formulate a national stewardship model and deployment strategy. The goal is to establish a national program that offers economic incentives to owners of land with critical natural assets such as forest to guarantee protection over the medium to long-term. Linked to the LCF and associated financing mechanisms developed through the project, this national program will help channel financial resources that empower rural communities to manage natural resources while improving human well-being. The program will act as a catalyst for replicating the Conservation Agreement model throughout the country to achieve community-based conservation and natural resource management at scale.

Finally, the project's effective demonstrations of integrated landscape management and land-use planning linked to sustainable commodity production will also serve as models for replication elsewhere in West Africa and beyond. This potential for wider replication motivates the project's substantial commitment to national, regional, and global

knowledge sharing. For example, CI Liberia already is in contact with the FAO-led process to develop a FOLUR project focused on palm oil in Guinea. Participation in learning exchange and dissemination through the FOLUR Global Platform will be part of a conscious effort to facilitate regional and wider replication. The model and implementation processes in Liberia may be of most immediate relevance to comparable regional smallholder contexts (such as Guinea), but the FOLUR Global Platform combined with CI's global presence and expertise also will allow the project partners to contribute to adaptation of learnings to other contexts.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

- 1) The project map coordinates are missing.
- 2) We don't see the Cocoa production area(s) in the map (unlike the palm oil concessions). Is this because they haven't yet been identified?
- 3) Within the NW Liberia landscape, the project sites are not clearly identified. In particular, the limit of Community land use planning is unclear, as it seems to be hidden by the Counties' boundaries.

05/18/21

Maps with coordinates are now included.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

- 1) NW Liberia landscape falls between 11.5° 0' 0''W 9.8° 0' 0''W and 9° 0' 0''N 6° 0' 0''N

Cocoa areas indicated on Map on p. 8

The coordinates for the project sites have also been attached

- 2) Revised map produced showing cocoa production areas and Palm oil concession as well as sites for restoration, and community land use planning clearly delineated.

NW Liberia Landscape coordinates are:

North = 08°33'03.0636", -010°26'32.1065"

South = 06°28'30.6553", -010°26'08.9103"

West = 07°33'21.8645", -011°30'15.2792"

East = 07°33'45.7019", -009°20'47.1079"

The coordinates for the project sites have also been attached

3) Clarified in map

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

12/15/20

No. The synergy with the FOLUR Global Platform should be further explored, and more details provided on how the project results will be generated at national and international levels thanks to its interaction with the Platform and the other countries participating in the Program. This not only includes KM, but also potentially such things as international dialogues, cooperation and potential enhanced engagement across sectors and within the region of West Africa. Further details of how engagement with Africa Palm Oil Initiative could help facilitate this may be warranted.

05/18/21

The section has been much improved. Linkages nationally and internationally are clearly explained. There is an adequate reflection of how the project contributes to the overall program impact.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

CEO endorsement/ portal section updated.

References enhanced throughout. Key instances are:

On p. 36 ProDoc:

Par. 129. The project will engage with global, regional, and national networks, platforms and initiatives on cocoa and palm oil commodities to share experiences and allow for cooperation and networking among peers, awareness raising and ultimately upscaling. For palm oil, the project will engage using existing multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms at the national and landscape levels established under the Good Growth Partnership (GGP) including the National Oil Palm Platform of Liberia and Northwest Liberia landscape Oil Palm Forum; for cocoa, the project will engage with the Liberia Cocoa Sector Working Group. These platforms will act as the main knowledge hubs to share lessons and to maximize engagement of all stakeholders on the ground.

On p. 27 ProDoc:

Par. 130. The project will also engage with regional platforms and initiatives focusing on cocoa and palm oil value chains (e.g., African Palm Oil Initiative, African Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative (AFR100), and West Africa Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance (WACSAA) through South-South cooperation and exchange visits with other FOLUR beneficiary countries in West Africa (Ivory Coast, Ghana, and Guinea). At the Global level, the project will engage with various bodies such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA) and Global Partnership on Forest and Landscape Restoration (GPFLR), Global Landscape Forum (GLF), the One Planet network (10YFP) Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) Programme, World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), UNDP Green Commodities Programme, and FOLUR-specific collaboration mechanisms that will be established.

On p. 62 ProDoc:

Par. 204. The proposed project will leverage and strengthen the current multi-stakeholder forums at the landscape level established under the Good Growth Partnership (GGP), another Core Partner of FOLUR. As noted, for palm oil, the project will engage using existing multi-stakeholder dialogue platforms at the national and landscape levels established under the Good Growth Partnership (GGP) including National Oil Palm Platform of Liberia and the Northwest Liberia landscape Oil Palm Forum; for cocoa, the project will engage with the Liberia Cocoa Sector Working Group. As the GGP-initiated platform continues to grow and achieve success in the palm oil sector, it could also be used to integrate other key agricultural crops such as

cocoa, cassava and rice especially in an agroforestry setting. At the global level, in addition to the aforementioned GPFLR and GLF, the project will engage with various bodies such as the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO), Global Alliance for Climate Smart Agriculture (GACSA), the One Planet network (10YFP), Sustainable Food Systems (SFS) Programme, World Cocoa Foundation (WCF), and the UNDP Green Commodities Programme.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) The 'Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities' category should be checked with a 'Yes' and the proposal indicates that will be direct beneficiaries of the project.

2) A stakeholder engagement plan is included in the package but the actual description of the engagement during the implementation phase (under the section IV of the document) is still missing some key information, including the roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan and the key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation, and steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise.

05/18/21

1) A detailed report on stakeholders already engaged is still missing from the portal version of the CER. A summary table uploaded to the CER would be clarifying and is necessary.

2) Roles and responsibilities are now included in document. Cleared

06/28/21

A summary table on stakeholder engagement is now included.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

Summary table indicating stakeholders that were consulted now included.

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

The IPLC box has been checked and following text added on pp. 129 (portions of this text also added on pp. 139 & 140 ProDoc) and in the CEO endorsement. Revised Stakeholder Engagement Plan uploaded.

In Liberia, there are no indigenous people but rather, local communities. The project will work in lands or territories traditionally owned, customarily used, or occupied by local communities, thus, the Project Management Unit will ensure that project activities embody the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). The principle of FPIC refers to the right of indigenous peoples to give or withhold their consent for any action that would affect their lands, territories, or rights, as recognized in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP). While FPIC is the right of indigenous peoples alone under international law, the principles underlying it are generally considered to be a good guideline for engaging any community or group of local stakeholders.

SECTION V: Stakeholder Engagement for Implementation Phase has been added (p. 179) to specify the roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan and the key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation, and steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise.

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
12/15/20

Yes, a thorough gender analysis has been completed.

Cleared

Agency Response
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
12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

- 1) The description of the private sector engagement is too limited. At this stage, there should be a clear and detailed presentation of all the private stakeholders which will be involved, at least those known at this stage (including with company names) and how concretely they will be engaged in the project implementation.
- 2) In addition, the focus is only on the Palm oil value chain. Consideration of cocoa value chain should also be added.
- 3) The work with Mano would seem to be key and is aligned with FOLUR design. Given the importance of Mano in the landscape and its identification as a co-financer of the project we would expect a much greater level of detail on the role that collaboration with this company will play. This strategy for engagement with Mano should be detailed to a greater extent and be evident throughout the strategy, components and outcomes/outputs aspects of the CEO ER, as well as the PS engagement section.

05/18/21

The comments have been adequately addressed and the section improved. The role of private sector as a stakeholder is now well elaborated. We are particularly pleased to see the plan for engagement with Manno well described, as well as the other supply chain actors which will be critical to carry out the integrated approach.

Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

- 1) Stakeholder Mapping Table expanded (see SEP):

Theobroma, a Dutch cocoa company, is also working with IDH to implement an agroforestry cocoa project in to restore tree cover to the grasslands in Foya. The project involves the cultivation of 40 hectares of cocoa intercropped with fruit trees, timber trees, plantain and pigeon peas. The idea is to limit the effects of bushfires during the dry season, and provide sustainable income and food security for the population of the area. The partners are now exploring the possibility of expanding the project.

Other private sector actors include Liberation Chocolate, Greentech, Intofawar Cooperative, Trade Link, Gbahlay Farmers Cooperative, Wienco

Other value chains actors include:

Liberia Agriculture and Asset Development Company (LAADCO) - Cocoa buyer

Nanorni oil palm cooperatives - Oil palm production, cattle introduction

Maliando cocoa cooperative - Buy products (rice, coffee, cocoa), cattle, support to farmers

N?torfawor cooperatives - Buy products (rice, coffee, cocoa), cattle, support to farmers

Manni rice farmers cooperative - Buy rice and support farmers

Foya rural women cooperative - Poultry and oil palm nursery production

Vainga Agriculture Development and Management Consultancy (VADEMCO) - Training of small scale cocoa farmers in basic modern cocoa production, pest management and control, as well as, cocoa intensification, among others.

2) ??See above.

3) Added to Mano role description on p. 70 ProDoc:

The relationship with Mano will be central to the success of the project. The MPOI concession is the single-largest land holding in Northwest Liberia, and thus occupies an outsized role in land use planning processes. As a potential purchaser of large volumes of oil palm fruit, it is also one of the largest economic actors in the landscape (MPOI has indicated that they intend to prioritize purchases from smallholders over expansion of its own managed commercial plantation area). Although the full strategy for engagement with Mano will be developed within the overall Private Sector Engagement Strategy in year one of the project, we can anticipate several key elements:

i. The EPA will engage MPOI to facilitate compliance with all Liberian environmental regulatory requirements. The transition of the concession from Sime Darby to MPOI left a small number of regulatory issues unresolved; these will be addressed as a precondition for further work (at the time of this submission, the EPA and MPOI have formally agreed on all the required steps).

ii. CI will work with MPOI specifically on the further refinement of corporate policies with respect to environmental sustainability and community engagement. (CI already has secured co-financing to support this work). When it took over the concession, MPOI adopted general Sime Darby policies and principles, which conform to RSPO requirements; MPOI itself is in the process of securing RSPO membership. CI's work will involve not only helping MPOI refine its policies and processes, but also support training of management and technical staff so as to embed sustainability principles and practices in the company's corporate culture and identity.

iii. In Land-use Planning processes with communities in and around the MPOI concession, MPOI will be engaged to participate so as to inform consideration of prospects and options for community-based smallholder oil palm development. This includes technical input as well as discussion of market opportunities, with an emphasis on logistical requirements for getting smallholder produce to the mill within the 24-hour window before spoilage.

iv. The project will work closely with MPOI to develop an investment prospectus for approaching potential impact investment sources, including &Green and Althelia. Company input into formulation of the business case will be valuable, as will corporate commitments including technical assistance and preferential purchasing, based on smallholder and community conformity with environmental and social standards.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1. The general climate change risk identified in section five as written is vague and requires references to climate data (perhaps from the Climate Risk and Related Disasters annex) to substantiate these assertions.

2. The climate risk also needs further clarification on the mitigation measures which have been identified and incorporated into the design of the project to reduce the likelihood and/or consequences of risks or to respond to consequences.

3. The "Climate Risk and Related Disasters" document is uploaded twice. One should be removed

4. The COVID-19 consideration is very limited. Nevertheless, the pandemic can affect different important elements of the project implementation, such as the co-financing among others, and some risk and opportunity analysis needs to be undertaken at this stage. Please further describe in few paragraphs 1- the current context as it relates to COVID; 2- what are the possible consequences of the pandemic and how important they can be for the project; 3- how the project will deal with with the identified likely impacts during its implementation; and 4- how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts and contribute toward a green recovery and building back better with more resilience (for ease of reference, we advise to present the analysis in a specific note after the risk table). For further clarification, the agency may wish to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14.

05/10/21

The comments have been addressed. The project has sufficiently elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

Added to risk section (see CEO ER and the ProDoc), see text below:

Other Potential environmental and social benefits and impacts

The project has potential environmental benefits. For instance, the promotion of tree and canopy crops, like cocoa in already degraded lands and rehabilitation of abandoned plantations is expected to significantly improve the canopy agro-ecosystems with positive climate and environmental benefits. More climate and environmental provisioning services (including food and freshwater), regulating services (including carbon sequestration, flood and erosion prevention, land degradation prevention and restoration, water purification, soil remediation, and pollination), supporting services (including soil formation and nutrient cycling), and cultural services (including recreation and aesthetics), if done well, can bring environmental benefits. Such services

will also enrich the biodiversity by creating new habitats and corridors for bird and animal populations. The mitigation monitoring strategy will ensure the preservation of virgin forests and wetlands. Adopting agroforestry (retaining trees in farmlands) and mixed cropping (with cover crops and anchor crops) will increase soil fertility, prevent erosion and reduce the use of pesticides and agrochemicals, resulting in an overall cleaner and safer environment.

However, the project has potential negative environmental impacts as expanding tree crop plantations could result in direct deforestation through tree crop farms expanding into forest land, or indirect deforestation where new tree crops displace other vegetable crops in the same farm, which in turn cause deforestation. To address this, the project will develop land use plans to ensure that activities will not cause direct or indirect deforestation.

Climate change issues: Projected climatic changes suggest that Liberia will suffer increasingly reduced climatic suitability for cocoa crops over the next 30 years. Maximum temperatures will increase and while overall precipitation is not projected to change significantly, the annual rainfall pattern and intensity will. This could result in increased risk of droughts during the wet season and rain during the dry season. Increased intensity when coupled with land clearing means a greater risk of surface runoff and topsoil erosion, increased risk of river damage to road infrastructure and increased risks of landslides. Changing patterns in rainy seasons can affect the farmers' ability to anticipate the best time to infield their cocoa seeds. In addition, even though cocoa trees are generally resistant to high temperatures, farmers will be supported to adopt coping mechanisms making their farms more productive (limited de-shading on their farms). The project also advocates for the adoption of cocoa varieties more resilient to higher temperatures; this will require cooperation with Universities and research centre such as the Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI).

Potential social benefits: The project will target about 50,000 direct local beneficiaries hence contributing to: reduction in unemployment especially among the youth; improved food security situation; and improved access to social services.

Potential negative social impacts include:

Land Access issues and restriction to resources due to tenure insecurity by women and youth in NW Liberia landscape. Without secure ownership or at least guaranteed access to land for women and youth, the production of sustainable palm oil and cocoa will be difficult, and this could negatively affect the project. The risk of being pushed out of the land leading to loss of investments after improvements have been made or even cash crops planted is high if the land is not appropriately secured or authorized by the relevant community and government institution. The project will address this issue by working with the relevant institutions such as LLA to create awareness about the 2019 Land Rights Act that recognizes the customary land tenure.

Also, land use planning activities by the project may restrict community access to land and forest resources for local populations who depend on these assets for domestic and commercial purposes which may cause tension and potential conflict. This impact is largely predictable, low in magnitude and expected to be temporary and reversible. The project proposes to ensure that stakeholders are consulted and alternatives provided for loss of access.

Unsafe and Non-Healthy Working Conditions: Working conditions across cocoa and palm oil sectors are generally poor in the rural areas of NW Liberia landscape because of general poverty, and poor production methods. In the agricultural sector, most farmers do back-breaking work. Due to high poverty and limited social services, there is also risk of child labour being used in the production of cocoa and palm oil.

Gender Based Violence (GBV): In NW Liberia landscape GBV is common, although cases are heavily underreported due to social and structural factors, including but not limited to unequal power relations, deeply rooted gender norms, poor legislation, and a weak justice system. The project risks exacerbating GBV if (a) women participants are not given permission by their spouses or if their participation takes them away from other responsibilities; (b) women's increases and associated financial independence could cause jealousy or power differences in households leading to increased GBV incidents; and (c) women are elected to leadership positions which may be seen as "taking away" those places where men traditionally rule.

Social Exclusion and Gender inequality is high in NW Liberia landscape because of patrilineal system. Women and youth are often not sufficiently represented even in making decision that affect them. Thus, women and youth not only risk being marginalized in land access, but also when opportunities or slots are allocated for economic activities in the community.

The scope and scale of the anticipated risks are expected to be site-specific, limited, localized, temporary and largely reversible. To mitigate against these risks. To address the above social and environmental risks, the project developed safeguards plans for stakeholder engagement, gender mainstreaming, process framework, accountability and grievance mechanism, cultural heritage management, and Gender Based Violence. (For details see ProDoc appendices VI - XI)

These risks and impacts are largely predictable, low in magnitude and are expected to be temporary and reversible. The impacts can easily be prevented and/or mitigated in a predictable manner. The legal and institutional framework for managing environmental risks and impacts exist and are adequate and the executing agencies have adequate capacity to prevent and/or mitigate environmental impacts

1) and 2) Climate Risk expanded, including mitigation measures. See Risk Table in CEO ER.

3) The portal will not allow us to delete uploaded attachments.

4) COVID-19 Risk Analysis added to the risk section.

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

12/15/20

No. Please address the following:

1) There is a need to clarify the real role of EPA. The proposal indicates that EPA is the executing agency, but it doesn't appear that they have a concrete role (see point 2 below). In addition as a regulatory agency perhaps aren't well suited to execute the technical aspects related to improving sustainability of ag commodities at the landscape level.

2) It needs to be clarified what is meant by Conservation International Liberia being a ?Co-executing Partner.? It appears that CI plans to carry out all of the execution functions. In particular given this statement in Para 199.

"The PMU be based in the CI Liberia Office in Monrovia and will be led by a full time Technical Lead, with support from Operations Officer, Gender and Safeguards Officer, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Manager, and others. The Technical Lead will maintain ultimate responsibility for this project, with input from senior EPA staff as well as the CI Technical Director, Operations Director, and Country Director?.

- Please note that any executing function proposed for CI needs to be described, justified, and clarified in institutional arrangement. In addition, it must be agreed to by the OFP through a formal letter before such an arrangement will be considered for an exception to the Implementing Agency/Executing Agency roles as stated in GEF policy. Understand that such an exception is not guaranteed by these actions but these are a necessary pre-condition for review by GEF management.

- Please clarify how you are defining sub-grantee vs partner. The former suggests they would be contracted to provide a service and the latter would indicate that they would not be paid to provide a service. Additionally, there are 2 lists of partners -in Para 196 and another list in Table 9. But their functions as ?partners? seem to be different. Clarification needed.

- Org chart. The roles of CI and EP should be labelled. Additionally, if EPA is in fact a co-executing partner, they should be at the same level/ or in the same box as CI on the Org Chart. We would also think that the PSC would be above the executing agency not at the same level.

05/18/21

1) We understand and accept the justification for EPA to serve as the lead government executing partner, but as the project should involve other ministries relevant to the landscapes and commodities, the role that EPA will play in terms of government coordination, including with whom they will need to liaise, should be indicated .

2) To determine the reasonableness of the request for CI to carry out executing function, in addition to the OFP letter a clear rationale should be provided that explains why it's necessary for CI to undertake some EA functions (ie. why government agencies or other civil society partners can't undertake these and how this was determined), what broad categories these functions fall into (as has already been provided in the OFP letter), and, importantly, how much of the budget for will be directed toward CI for execution of the functions identified. This can be provided as a separate document with relevant points included in the coordination section.

3) Further to point two, in the budget more clearly identifying the entity (gov't, project partners, CI) that will be allocated financing for each budget line item is required.

06/28/21

1) The coordination role of the EPA will play, including with whom they will need to liaise, is now understood. Cleared

2) The rationale provided by the Agency on why it's necessary for them to undertake some EA functions is sufficient. Cleared

3) The budget has been revised and the amounts allocated to each partner are now clear. Please corroborate that CI staff whose costs are fully or mostly covered by the project budget will act as project personnel dedicated entirely to GEF FOLUR project activities.

07/13/21

The agency has confirmed that staff costs reflected in the staffing plan, including those staff dedicated 100% to the project, is accurate and a reflection of the actual time these staff will spend on the project. We do ask that the agency remains vigilant in ensuring that the person hours dedicated to the project is aligned with that which is charged.

The institutional arrangement for project implementation well described.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/07/2021:

CI is submitting a staffing plan which shows the staff that will be hired and dedicated full-time to the project and existing staff, which has been budgeted in accordance with the expected level of effort required to implement the project. The existing staff will bring experience from previous GEF projects, which will facilitate the start of the project implementation and should also create economies of scale, as some positions will only be needed on a part-time basis for the project.

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

Added part of the explanation below to the ProDoc on page 69, paragraphs 234 and 235 (changes highlighted in yellow in the CEO ER under institutional arrangements and coordination.;

1. EPA as the lead government executing partner will collaborate and work closely with other relevant government agencies and ministries including Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), Forestry Development Authority (FDA), Liberia Land Authority (LLA), Liberia Agricultural Commodity Regulatory Authority (LACRA), The Cooperative Development Agency (CDA), Ministry of Internal Affairs (MIA), Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MoGCSP), National Bureau of Concessions (NBC), Ministry of Finance and Development Planning (MFDP), and Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services (LISGIS).

The EPA will coordinate and collaborate on ad-hoc basis and through the established coordination mechanisms such as (a) the Project Steering Committee (PSC) meetings held quarterly with the Heads of these government agencies and ministries. The proposed PSC is chaired by EPA and co-chaired by MoA; (b) involving the relevant government agencies and ministries in joint monitoring of project activities; and (c) sector coordination meetings held to promote close collaboration between the project and relevant ongoing and planned government initiatives and ensure project outputs and outcomes are mainstreamed into government policies, laws, and regulations.

Further, the EPA will ensure that the relevant government agencies and ministries receive the in-kind grants on time and each entity provides acknowledgement letters accordingly.

2. CI has the requisite systems and mechanisms as well as demonstrated (prior) experience in:

- a) managing GEF funded projects including the GGP project focused on sustainable oil palm production;
- b) biodiversity conservation in NW Liberia landscape using landscape wide approach;
- c) convening, facilitating and engaging in multi-stakeholder processes;
- d) engagement with commodity platforms and industry bodies at the landscape, national, regional, and international levels; and
- e) brokering partnerships with the private sector

How CI was determined to lead execution of FOLUR project.

When the GEF put out a call for Expression of Interest for FOLUR projects, the Government of Liberia through the OFP - Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) held a multi-stakeholder consultation process to determine the focal landscapes and identify key actors and partners. The actors that participated in this multi-stakeholder consultation process included the the Government of Liberia represented by the Environmental Protection Agency, Ministry of Agriculture, National Bureau of Concessions, and Forestry Development Authority.

Through this multi-stakeholder process, NW Liberia landscape was agreed upon as the target landscape for FOLUR project, and CI Liberia was selected to lead in the execution of the FOLUR project based on the following reasons:

i. Demonstrated experience and expertise in execution of full sized and medium sized GEF funded projects. Currently, CI Liberia is implementing two GEF funded projects including:

- a) Conservation and Sustainable of Liberia's coastal natural capital NCA (GEF ID: 9573)

Responses to 2 and 3 included in attachment

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

1 and 2) The roles of the EPA and CI are clarified:

The Environmental Protection Agency of Liberia (EPA) as the Project's Executing Agency will play the lead role in monitoring the project, providing oversight, and maintaining its strategic focus, with Conservation International Liberia as the Project's

Executing Partner. The EPA has been deeply involved during the preparatory phase and will continue to play a strong role during the execution of the project. Field execution of activities will be undertaken by CI Liberia, partners and sub-grantees with the requisite expertise and field experience. (Sub-grantees are actors contracted to provide a service on behalf of the executing agency, paid using GEF funds; partners are not for services).

Because of the sheer size of the landscape, other partners sub-grantees including FFI, SCNL, and RSPB were selected because of their active presence and prior experience in the project sites in line with the GEF-7 guidelines of multi-partners and multi-stakeholder collaboration. For instance, SCNL and RSPB have presence and on-going community engagement and conservation planning initiatives around the Gola Forest National Park areas, while FFI are present and have on-going conservation management initiatives in Wonegizi and Wologizi Proposed Protected Areas.

3) Please see revised organogram.

4) clarification on subgrantee vs grantee done throughout the section.

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

12/15/20

Yes, the project is aligned with relevant national strategies and plans.

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

12/15/20

Yes, timeline and set deliverables are elaborated in the ProDoc.

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
12/15/20

Yes, the project includes a budgeted M&E plan that adequately monitors and measures results.

Cleared

Agency Response
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
12/15/20

Yes, socio-economic benefits are adequately described, including how they translate into the supporting GEBs. (We note that some of the information in this section might be useful to share as part of the project justification).

Cleared

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

Yes. (We note that some of the information on project location and biophysical characteristics in the ESS might be useful to share as part of the project justification).

Cleared

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

Please indicate if/how the agency factored GEFSEC comments at the time of PFD approval, which are below:

1) 100,000 ha are indicated being managed to benefit biodiversity. Is this reasonable in the landscape considered?

2) For the 50,000 ha as HCVF loss avoided is the assumption that it would be 100% deforested without this project, and that with the project there would be 0% deforestation?

3) Even if STAR resources from CC aren't being used, an estimate should be included as it is expected that GHG mitigation will occur as a result of avoided HCV loss, restoration and improved land management.

05/18/21

The GEF Secretariat comments have been adequately addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF Response 05/05/2021:

- 1) Costs per hectare. A study done in 2011 by FDA and UNDP that showed that the cost per hectare for Sustainable forest management is US\$ 2.50., and the cost per hectare for Afforestation and Reforestation is USD\$150.00 (Kantor and UNDP. 2011. Assessment of Investment and Financial Flows for mitigation in the forestry sector in Liberia). see p.43 in ProDoc.
- 2) The total HCVF area that is outside of the formal protected areas is 246,007 ha. So, through the project, conservation agreements will be signed with communities to with nine clans to conserve 50,000 ha of HCVF areas outside formal protection. This 50,000 ha was determined using GIS as the area of land under the jurisdictions of the nine selected clans. see P.42 and P.108 of ProDoc
- 3) Addressed and reflected throughout the CEO ER and ProDoc, based on Core Indicator table (p. 108 ProDoc).

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

Please review any relevant comments from Council at the time of the PFD review and address accordingly.

05/18/21

The agency should acknowledge that council comments have been reviewed for relevance to the FOLUR Liberia CP.

06/28/21

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/15/2021: CI included an updated Annex B in the portal showing how the project addressed comments from council members

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

Council comments were reviewed and addressed during the PPG phase.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

Please review any relevant comments from STAP at the time of the PFD review and address accordingly.

05/18/21

The agency should acknowledge that these have been reviewed as there may be general STAP comments on the FOLUR design that are relevant to the Liberia CP.

06/28/21

Cleared

Agency Response

CI-GEF 09/15/2021: CI included an updated Annex B in the portal showing how the project addressed comments from STAP

CI-GEF 06/17/2021:

STAP comments were reviewed and addressed during the PPG phase.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/15/20

Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
12/15/20

Please provide project coordinates.

05/18/21

Coordinates have been provided.

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12/15/20

No. Please address the above comments.

05/18/21

No. Please address the remaining comments.

06/28/21

No. Please respond to the remaining comments.

07/13/21

No. Please address the two remaining comments.

07/21/21

The CEO endorsement recommended.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

12/15/2020

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/13/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/21/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations