



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9051		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Moringa Agro-forestry Fund for Africa (non-grant)		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$12,000,000
Co-financing:	\$50,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$62,800,000
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Neeraj Vij

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>March 17, 2015. JMS/DER.</p> <p>a) The Non Grant Pilot can provide financing by LD, BD, and CC focal areas, but not the SFM incentive program. Please, revise the table A and D.</p> <p>b) Explain and justify the breakdown of resources between focal areas. We potentially understand the reasoning for multiple benefits, but it will be challenging to demonstrate the eligibility under BD and CCM strategies, when the sub-projects are not fully described and the real BD and CCM GEB will be difficult to quantify (biodiversity of international importance, number of ha under a certification system, CO2 emissions cuts, etc.). We would like to recommend to only develop the project under the LD focal area, using</p>

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>the programs under LD1, LD2, and LD3.</p> <p>March 27, 2015 JMS/DER Addressed.</p>
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>March 17, 2015. JMS/DER. Addressed.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>March 17, 2015. JMS/DER. Addressed.</p>
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>March 17, 2015. JMS/DER.</p> <p>a) - Yes for LD GEB.</p> <p>b) Please explain the structure of the GEF investment and the financing terms for the GEF funding. Will it match the indicative terms shown on page 10? Will our equity investment be pari-pasu with the agency investment in the Moringa fund? Is the Target Gross IRR of 10-12% inclusive of risk-adjusted loss? If not, what types of losses could happen?</p> <p>c) The terms shown on page 10 indicate an investment period of five years, but a fund life of 12 years. Please explain these terms. How long will the GEF funding in any single project be invested? Will GEF funding be recycled into additional investments during the 12 years? What is the view of the need for such a fund after 12 years? Will the GEF and agency investment be catalytic and draw in private capital, thus reducing the need for extension?</p> <p>d) Please explain where the GEF funding will be invested as compared to the AfDB funding? It appears on page 11 that AfDB will be "to an African-based vehicle." Will AfDB be able to represent the GEF investment on all appropriative investment review committees and structures?</p> <p>e) Also, please clarify the expected reflow of returns to</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>the GEF, including a timeline specifying, in principle, when the expected payments would be made to the GEF Trust Fund. On page 16 the project proposal, the fund will "seek to generate annual returns from its investments." Therefore, will GEF receive annual reflows? Please clarify.</p> <p>f) Please describe the proposed approach for dealing with project developers that are not on track to succeed. Does the Moringa Fund have means for intervening to help project developers?</p> <p>g) Page 16 refers to "years 7 and 8 for each investment." Please explain how that aligns with the statement on page 10 of indicative terms of five-year investment period.</p> <p>h) In order to quality for GEF funding, specific investments must be in full compliance with GEF strategic focal area objectives covered by this project as specified in Table A. The GEF Partner agency has three options for obtaining GEF Secretariat concurrence: 1) In advance, under Option 1 on page 9, paragraph 52, of GEF/C.42/Inf.08, Operational Modalities for Public Private Partnership Programs; 2) Concurrent - prior to each investment decision under Option 2; or 3) Hybrid combination of option 1 and option 2 where option 2 is used on special types investments. Please specify which option the Agency will pursue. If Option 1 is selected, please describe how the agency and its investment partners will ensure investments meet these criteria.</p> <p>i) Please check the cofinancing mentioned in the table C with the information provided p 10. Provide all numbers in US\$.</p> <p>March 27, 2015 JMS/DER Some clarifications have been made by email. The PIF has been revised accordingly. All points have been addressed.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently	March 17, 2015. JMS/DER.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	<p>clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBS?</p>	<p>No. Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) Revise the table B, with a particular attention to the outputs of the first component. Provide outcomes and outputs that are aligned with the Focal Area Objectives in the Table A.</p> <p>b) Under the provisions of the GEF non-grant pilot, the GEF non-grant pilot cannot fund technical assistance unless that technical assistance is included in the investment funding and delivers a return on the investment. It may be logical to show the TA components being fully funded by the co-financing. Since the Moringa fund is managed by CBR and the Technical Assistance Facility is managed by ONFI, it will be difficult, but not impossible, to use the GEF investment funding as technical assistance. If the agency wishes to pursue this approach, please contact the GEFSEC to discuss. Otherwise, please remove the GEF funding from TA.</p> <p>c) A set of four project components listed on page 8, including capacity building, do not show up in Table B. Please explain these components and how they relate to the investment component of the project.</p> <p>d) In the impact projection provided, a total of 9.5 million tCO₂e is presented, but no time frame is provided. Please clarify the emissions benefits estimate.</p> <p>e) Please propose project timelines including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) expected date for submission of CEO endorsement; 2) expected date for complete investment of all GEF funding; 3) expected duration for the GEF project with expected dates for mid-term review, project completion, and submission of the terminal evaluation; 4) expected lifetime of the investments and whether these will continue after the project completion date; 5) schedule of reflows, including an indicative timeline specifying when the expected payments would be made

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>to the GEF Trust Fund.</p> <p>March 27, 2015 JMS/DER Some clarifications have been made by email. The PIF has been revised accordingly. All points have been addressed.</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 17, 2015. JMS/DER. Addressed.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>March 17, 2015. JMS/DER.</p> <p>- This project requests funding from the non-grant pilot. Sufficient funding is available for this project if it is proposed for work program inclusion.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 17, 2015. JMS/DER.</p> <p>We thank the Agency for a very interesting proposal. However, the PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>March 27, 2015, JMS/DER All points have been addressed. The PIF is technically cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		<p>At CEO endorsement, please clarify the following points:</p> <p>a) Provide additional detail on the pipeline of project developers, types of projects, locations, readiness and other market assessment information to better judge the planned investments;</p> <p>b) Please provide a revenue model;</p> <p>c) Please provide details on the other partners, management team, and the structure;</p> <p>d) Please clarify the opportunities to scale the Moringa fund after the end of the GEF investment;</p> <p>e) Please clarify the schedule of reflows using the GEF provided template or the equivalent.</p>
Review Date	Review	March 17, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 27, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument</i> : Has a reflow calendar been presented?	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council • Convention Secretariat	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	