



## REQUEST FOR: CEO Endorsement

**Project Type: Full sized Project**

**Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund**

### PART I PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>Project Title:</b> Participatory assessment of land degradation and sustainable land management in grassland and pastoral systems			
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Global	<b>GEF Project ID</b>	5724
<b>GEF Agency (ies)</b>	FAO	<b>GEF Agency Project ID:</b>	628937
<b>Other Executing Partners</b>	IUCN	<b>Submission Date</b>	23 March 2016
<b>GEF Focal Area (s)</b>	Land Degradation	<b>Project Duration (Months)</b>	36
<b>Name of Parent Program</b>	N/A	<b>Project Agency Fee (\$)</b>	250,774

#### **A. Focal Area Strategy Framework**

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-Financing (\$)
LD-4 Adaptive Management and Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outcome 4.2: Improved GEF portfolio monitoring using new and adapted tools and methodologies.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Output 4.2: GEF-financed projects contribute to SLM/SFM/INRM knowledge base.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	GEF TF	2,639,726	5,762,270
<b>Total project costs</b>		<b>2,639,726</b>	<b>5,762,270</b>

#### **B. Project Framework**

<b>Project Objective:</b> Strengthen the capacity of local and national stakeholders in pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands to assess Land Degradation (LD) and make informed decisions to promote Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in a way that preserves the diverse ecosystem goods and services that are provided by rangelands and grasslands						
Project Component	Grant Type <sup>1</sup>	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands	TA	1. A participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands, is developed and tested	1.1 A Monitoring and assessment procedural and operational manual is developed.  1.2 The Monitoring and assessment procedural and operational manual is tested at local level and the global indicators are further adapted while assessing policies.	GEF TF	1,591,526	2,530,000

<sup>1</sup> TA includes capacity building and research and development.

		<p><i>Target:</i></p> <p><i>(1) Procedural and operational manual is developed and published based on feedback and lessons learned from participating countries</i></p> <p><i>(2) Technical consortium of experts is set-up and meets regularly</i></p>	<p>1.3 The assessment and monitoring method is refined and finalised based on lessons learned from the district/site tests.</p>				
Component 2: Inform international and national agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making process	TA	<p>2. National and international agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making processes are informed and benefit from the assessment and monitoring procedural</p> <p><i>Target:</i></p> <p><i>(1) National workshops conducted in each country to present and discuss the action plan, identify SLM best practices and feasible measures to influence policy making regarding pastoral areas</i></p> <p><i>(2) Standardized assessment and monitoring method for LD and SLM in grasslands and rangelands is recognized by at least 2 international fora</i></p>	<p>2.1 Participatory national grassland and rangeland assessment results are linked to national and local decision-making processes</p> <p>2.2 Assessment and monitoring method shared with relevant international mechanisms in order to integrate/align with existing frameworks</p>	GEF-TF	733,738	2,732,270	
Component 3: Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation	TA	<p>3. Project's outcome and output targets are monitored and evaluated, and lessons learned and best practices are captured and disseminated to facilitate future operations</p> <p><i>Target: Project results achieved, demonstrating sustainability</i></p>	<p>3.1 A project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress towards the project outcome and output targets is set-up and implemented</p> <p>3.2 Midterm and final evaluation/review conducted</p> <p>3.3 Project related best practices and lessons learned are documented and published</p>	GEF-TF	188,761	400,000	
Sub-Total						<b>2,514,025</b>	<b>5,662,270</b>
Project management Cost					LDCF	125,701	100,000

<b>Total project costs</b>	<b>2,639,726</b>	<b>5,762,270</b>
----------------------------	------------------	------------------

### C. Sources of Confirmed Cofinancing for the Project by Source and by Name (\$)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	FAO	Cash	1.000.000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-Kind	1.000.000
International Organisation	IUCN	Cash	1.100.000
International Organisation	IUCN	In-kind	100.000
International Organisation	PKH	In-kind	562.270
International Organisation	MPS	In-kind	500.000
GEF Agency	FAO AGPM	Cash	300.000
Government	Uruguay	In-Kind	1.200.000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>5.762.270</b>

### D. Trust fund Resources Requested by agency, Focal Area and country

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee(\$)(b)	Total (\$) (a + b)
FAO	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Global	2,639,726	250,774	2,890,500
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>2,639,726</b>	<b>250,774</b>	<b>2,890,500</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

### E. Consultants working for technical assistance components (\$):

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
Local consultants	80.000		80.000
International consultants	1.043.201		1.043.201

## **PART II PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

### **A. Describe any changes in alignment with the project design of the original PIF**

#### **A.1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports etc.**

1. Compare to the PIF, the Project Document provides more details on the Alignment with National Development Goals and Policies per country of intervention, as provided in Section 1.6.1 of the Project Document.
2. Additional information is also provided on the alignment with UNCCD National Action Plans in Section 1.6.2.

#### **A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities**

3. The PIF provides an accurate description of the Project's alignment to GEF focal areas and strategies.
4. More detailed information is provided in the Project Document in Section 1.6.3

### A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage

5. The FAO's comparative advantage has been strengthened since the original PIF and is described in further details in Section 1.3 of the Project Document.

### A.4 The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address

6. The problem analysis and the description of the baseline situation have been thoroughly reviewed since the PIF that only presented a brief narrative of the scenario. Baseline initiatives are now presented for each pilot country in a synthetic but comprehensive manner in Section 1.2.1 of the Project Document.

*Table 1 Introduction to related baseline and co-financing projects and programmes*

Title and Project Objective/Description	Lead Agency	Co-financing amount and duration	Co-financing support to project
<p><b>Building Drought Resilience through Land and Water Management in Arid and Semi-Arid Areas, Kenya and Uganda</b>            The specific objective of the project is to improve the resilience of dryland communities, to the impacts of increasingly severe and frequent drought and floods, within well-managed river catchment ecosystems. This project has components of resource mapping and tracking of rangeland healthy status as a result of project interventions.</p>	IUCN	USD 1,000,000 2016-2018	Component 1 and 2
<p><b>Enhancing the Value of Ecosystem Services in Pastoral Systems</b>            This project aims to assist policymakers, planners and pastoralists in using insights on the role of ecosystem services to support the livelihoods of pastoralists and to identify grazing and rangeland management options that will strengthen livelihood support over the long-term</p>	IUCN through ILRI funding	USD 100,000	Component 1 and 2
<p><b>Global Dryland Initiative</b>            The GDI supports the sustainable management of dryland ecosystems and the conservation of dryland biodiversity. The project will be integrated into the first priority area of the IUCN GDI, e.g. Strengthening Evidence for Targeting and Monitoring in Dryland Ecosystem. Under this priority area, IUCN is developing adapted and scalable methodologies for assessing non-equilibrium dryland ecology, to provide stronger evidence for policy and investment decisions from local to global levels.</p>	IUCN	USD 100,000 2016-2019	Project Management Costs
<p><b>EU-ACP project in Burkina Faso and Niger “Action against desertification in support of the implementation of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel initiative and south-south cooperation in ACP countries” and the “Global Drylands Assessment”</b>            The objective is to improve the condition and productivity of the agro-sylvo-pastoral landscapes affected by Desertification, LD and Drought in 8 ACP countries, one of them being Burkina Faso. Expected outcomes of this project are very closely related to those of the GEF project.</p>	FAO-FOA through EU-ACP funding	USD 2,000,000 2016-2019	Component 1 Output 1.2

<b>Pastoralist Knowledge Hub</b> PKH is an FAO initiative through which information can be developed, shared and used among pastoralists. The PKH is active in Latin America and will be a key platform for dissemination of lessons learned and best practices collected as part of this project. The objective of the PKH is to fill the gaps identified over the past years, especially the lack of global policy discussions on pastoralism and the need to bring the challenges faced by pastoral communities to attention.	PKH	USD 562,270 2016-2019	Component 2 and 3 Output 2.2, and Output 3.3
<b>Mountain Partnership Secretariat</b> MPS is a UN alliance of partners dedicated to improve the lives of mountain people and protecting mountain environments. MPS has some on-going activities in Kyrgyzstan supporting pasture management.	MPS	USD 500,000 2016-2019	Component 2 and 3 Output 2.2 and Output 3.3
<b>FAO Plant Production and Protection Division</b> FAO's AGP is working on similar approaches and will contribute in cash.	FAO AGPM	USD 300,000 2016-2019	Component 1 Output 1.2
<b>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries in Uruguay (MGAP)</b> The project will form integral part of the MGAP's efforts in the implementation and fine tuning of related agricultural policies. The Ministry will therefore provide support in form of technology and technical assistance.	Ministry	1,200,000 2016-2019	Component 1 and 2

**A.5 Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project**

*Changes in the results framework compared to the PIF*

7. The project results framework has been re-structured to accommodate comments provided by STAP and the GEF Sec. The interconnection between Component 1 and 2 were strengthened, the flow of outputs and related activities clarified and better linked to the problem statement and the overall project objective. Component 1 now consists in the development of a participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas. Component 2 aims to inform international and national agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making processes. This will be done by compiling SLM local best practices and measures identified during the initial assessment performed under Component 1 and by using these to inform tangible national policies, including through follow-up support that will be provided by the national partner organisations closely involved in all project activities.
8. The full project framework is described in detail in the FAO-GEF Project Document (Section 2.3) and Annex A of this CEO Endorsement request. The adjustments introduced into the project results framework and the rationale are described below.

Table 2: Changes introduced in the Project's Results Framework compare to PIF

PIF RF	Prodoc RF	Justification
<p><b>Objective:</b> Improve the assessment capability and the decision making process of pastoral, agrosylvo-pastoral, and grassland system stakeholders in lowland and mountain areas to reverse LD, enhance food security and resilience to climate change, as well as to improve the conservation of biodiversity.</p>	<p><b>Objective:</b> Strengthen the capacity of local and national stakeholders in pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands to assess LD and make informed decisions to promote SLM in a way that preserves the diverse ecosystem goods and services that are provided by rangelands and grasslands.</p>	<p>Objective reworded to better accommodate the changes in the RF and respond to the two components, the first one focusing on the development and testing of the assessment methodology, and the second one on linking the results to policy development processes.</p>
<p><b>Component 1:</b> Design an integrated and participatory assessment process to estimate multiple benefits in grassland/pastoral areas (including mountain areas and agrosylvo-pastoral areas) and to support policy and investment in decision making</p>	<p><b>Component 1:</b> Participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands.</p>	<p>The first component is now focusing on the whole assessment process. During the PPG, the PIF RF appeared confusing as it proposed to design and test the assessment methodology in both Component 1 and 2.</p>
<p><u>Outcome 1.1:</u> Integrated herders self-assessment process in place to evaluate LD and SLM and tested in at least three regions in collaboration with the Pastoral Knowledge Hub.</p>	<p><u>Outcome 1.</u> A participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands, is developed and tested.</p>	<p>There is only one Outcome in the Prodoc RF under Component 1 as the links with policy development processes are now part of Component 2 to avoid mixing the development of the assessment and monitoring system and its dissemination.</p>
<p><u>Output 1.1.1</u> A procedure for local level agro-sylvo-pastoral and grassland LD/SLM analysis designed, validated and disseminated based on Pastoral Knowledge Hub and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) data requirements and following lessons learned from other pastoral and LD/SLM initiatives requiring similar data assessing (at least 9 INRM systems in 9 countries analysed).</p>	<p><u>Output 1.1</u> A Monitoring and assessment procedural and operational manual is developed.  <u>Output 1.2</u> The Monitoring and assessment procedural and operational manual is tested at local level and the global indicators are further adapted while assessing policies.  <u>Output 1.3</u> The assessment and monitoring method is refined and finalised based on lessons learned from the district/site tests.</p>	<p>3 Outputs have been added in the RF under this Outcome to better show the different steps of the development process of the assessment and monitoring methodology.</p>
<p><u>Outcome 1.2:</u> LD/SLM monitoring strategies focusing on grassland and pastoral systems developed to: i) reinforce policy development and planning in dry-land grassland and livestock systems and landscapes and ii) mobilise most appropriate investments in locally-controlled rangelands.</p>		<p>There is only one Outcome in the Prodoc RF under Component 1 as the links with policy development processes are now part of Component 2 to avoid mixing the development of the assessment and monitoring system and its dissemination.</p>
<p><u>Output 1.2.1</u> At least 5 SLM assessment tools developed facilitating decision making and planning in pastoral areas, and identifying areas requiring policy and institutional support based on stakeholders consultations and lessons learned from other partner initiatives (LADA, SHARP, and DAD-IS monitoring systems) to enhance local and national level policy environment (i.e. through bylaws, service to market, establishment of revolving funds, etc).</p>		

PIF RF	Prodoc RF	Justification
<b>Component 2:</b> Calibrate and test methods for LD and SLM assessment through pilot studies in mountain and lowland grassland/pastoral areas in at least three regions	<b>Component 2:</b> Inform international and national agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making process	Component 2 in the PIF was focused on testing the LD and SLM assessment. During the PPG, it was considered that testing the assessment system was intrinsically linked to its development and shouldn't be done under a different component. Testing is therefore now exclusively part of Component 1.
<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Sustained flow of ecosystem services analysed through appropriate indicators that support evidence based selection of at least 20 INRM practices	<b>Outcome 2.</b> National and international agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making processes benefit from the assessment and monitoring procedural and operational manual and the participatory national grassland and rangeland assessments.	Outcome 2.1 in the PIF was linked to the testing of the assessment and monitoring methodology. Outcome 2 in the Prodoc is rather focusing on linking the assessment and monitoring methodology to decision making processes. The testing of the assessment is now part of Component 1 only.
<b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Grassland, agro-sylvo-pastoral, and livestock related indicators developed, tested and piloted in selected projects (see list of cofinancing and collaborating partners). Indicators will include, but will not be limited to; a livelihood analysis, soil and grassland biodiversity, water holding capacity and water cycle improvement, meat and dairy quantity and safety, sustainable livestock management, livestock management in agro-forestry areas, impact of livestock genetic diversity on LD, impact of LD in wild plant and animal species composition, biomass productivity assessment, biomass and soil carbon cycle, land use change and encroaching crop and forest issues	<b>Output 2.1</b> Participatory national grassland and rangeland assessment results are linked to national and local decision-making processes <b>Output 2.2</b> Assessment and monitoring method shared with relevant international mechanisms in order to integrate/align with existing frameworks	Two Outputs have been added in the Prodoc RF to better differentiate between linking the assessment and monitoring methodology to national and local policy processes on the one hand, and to international mechanisms on the other hand.
<b>Component 3:</b> Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation	<b>Component 3:</b> Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation	No changes
<b>Outcome 3.1:</b> The project's outcome and output targets are monitored and evaluated, and "lessons learned" on best practices are captured and disseminated to facilitate future operations.	<b>Outcome 3.</b> Project's outcome and output targets are monitored and evaluated, and lessons learned and best practices are captured and disseminated to facilitate future operations	No changes.
<b>Output 3.1.1.</b> Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcome and output targets <b>Output 3.1.2.</b> Midterm and final evaluation conducted <b>Output 3.1.3.</b> Project related "best-practices" (BP) and "lessons-learned" documented and published (by using the Pastoral Knowledge Hub baseline structure)	<b>Output 3.1</b> A project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress towards the project outcome and output targets is set-up and implemented <b>Output 3.2</b> Midterm and final evaluation/review conducted <b>Output 3.3</b> Project related best practices and lessons learned are documented and published	No changes

### *Incremental reasoning*

9. The incremental reasoning has been thoroughly reviewed and further clarified since the PIF stage. It is now based on a more solid problem analysis and takes additional baseline initiatives into account. The project aims at addressing the lack of harmonized participatory assessment and monitoring systems for LD and SLM in pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands that can comprehensively inform pastoral, livestock and land policy makers. In order to achieve the latter, the project will develop a methodology to assess and monitor LD and SLM in pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands - through a globally comparable and participatory approach. To address the current challenges, and building on lessons learned from past initiatives, the project is developed around two main components. The first component aims at designing a participatory and holistic system to assess and monitor LD and SLM in pastoral areas, while the second component aims at systematically feeding the findings of the assessment and monitoring system into policy making processes for decision-makers on pastoral areas management. The baseline situation and the project's incremental contribution within the two components can be summarized as follows:

#### Component 1: Participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands

10. In the current baseline situation, several tools already exist to monitor and assess LD and SLM. However, none of these tools currently have a specific and detailed replicable method to monitor LD and SLM practices in grasslands and rangelands, nor a coherent framework of indicators developed in a participatory manner that focusses on assessing the multiple ecosystem benefits grasslands and rangelands do provide. The GEF incremental support will therefore address the current lack of a framework comprising of holistic indicators in order to assess and monitor grasslands and rangelands.
11. GEF funding will allow the proposed project to build upon numerous previous initiatives, taking into account their advantages and drawbacks. The final assessment and monitoring method to be created by the project will therefore include a procedural and operational manual to conduct the assessment through a framework of comparable indicators by domain of assessment. For each pilot country, these indicators by domain of assessment will be tested and then specified in local specific indicators, to be defined together with local communities, tested on the field and then aggregated at a broader level. On the one hand, the framework will aim to be holistic, encompassing the wide range of bio-physical, socio-economic, institutional and policy conditions that relate to grassland and rangeland SLM. On the other hand, the framework will aim to link information across multiple scales ranging from the local to the national and global scale and relevant policy frameworks. One of the major challenges will be to select indicators that can be assessed by local herders and agro-pastoralists based on perception, experience and that are relevant to local cultural and indigenous knowledge. Finally, this set of indicators will be based on existing experience using LD and SLM indicators to ensure a robust scientific validity and future replication.

#### Component 2: Inform international and national agro-pastoral decision making processes

12. In the baseline a number of pastoral knowledge exchange mechanisms exist operating at different levels (national, regional and global). However the knowledge transfer with regards to LD assessment for grasslands and rangelands is limited and fragmented as no holistic assessment system exist. The provision of accurate guidance to policy makers in a comprehensive manner is therefore not possible. Component 2 of the project will address this challenge by ensuring that the international and national agro-pastoral decision making processes will benefit from the assessment and monitoring results developed under Component 1.
13. GEF incremental funding will therefore allow to feed the results of the assessment and monitoring performed at the local level into local, national and global decision making processes. At the local level, the result of the assessment and monitoring will provide an opportunity to identify and scale up SLM best practices. At the national and sub-national levels, GEF funding will enable the project to feed the result of the assessment into existing national and sub-national processes including



national and local planning, and into existing knowledge sharing and pastoral advocacy networks such as the Pastoral Knowledge Hub and the Mountain Partnership. These networks are already contributing to influence policy at the national and regional and the project will back their advocacy on evidence based data provided by the LD and SLM assessment of grasslands and rangelands at local level. At the global level, through the GEF incremental funding, the operational and procedural method produced through the project, including the framework of global comparable indicators, will be disseminated to relevant global mechanisms such as the UNCCD and other scientific panels. The project should enable the uptake of the holistic assessment framework, applicable worldwide from the global to the local scale, as a commonly agreed baseline that will enable comparability and replicability between countries.

The detailed incremental reasoning is presented in Section 1.2.3 of the Project Document and under each component in Section 1.2.4.

#### *Expected global environmental and adaptation benefits*

14. The project will develop a procedure manual with a framework of indicators to enable the participatory assessment and monitoring of LD and SLM in pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands at a global scale. A long term benefit of this assessment and monitoring tool for LD and SLM in grasslands and rangelands would be to provide information on pastoral area management and allow local communities and policy makers to make informed decisions, better fit to reverse LD and promote SLM in pastoral areas.

#### **A.6. Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:**

15. The risk analysis has been reviewed and strengthened since the PIF. It is summarized in the Risk Matrix presented in Appendix 5 of the Project Document.

#### **A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

16. FAO and the project partners will collaborate with other programs and projects in order to identify opportunities and mechanisms to facilitate synergies with other relevant GEF projects, as well as projects supported by other donors. This collaboration will include: (i) informal communications between GEF agencies and other partners in implementing programs and projects; and (ii) exchange of information and outreach materials between projects.
17. In particular, this project will collaborate with the following GEF projects that are currently implemented by FAO in the pilot countries:
  - Integrating Climate Resilience into Agricultural and Pastoral Production for Food Security in Vulnerable Rural Areas in Burkina Faso through the Farmer Field School Approach. GEF ID 5014 (FAO/LDCF);
  - Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production for food security in vulnerable rural areas in Niger through the Farmers Field School approach. GEF ID 4702 (FAO/LDCF);
  - Climate-smart livestock production and land restoration in the Uruguayan rangelands. GEF ID 9153 (FAO MFA); and
  - Sustainable management of mountainous forest and land resources under climate change conditions. GEF ID 4761 (FAO MFA).
18. The Project Document (Section 4.1.2) provides a detailed and updated list of initiatives with which the project will coordinate with, in each country of intervention.

## **B. Additional information not addressed at PIF Stage**

### **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation:**

#### **B.1.1 Project implementation and management arrangements**

19. The Project Management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E through its decision-making structures: the Project Steering Committee and the Technical and Scientific Resource Expert Group.
20. A **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** will have the role of overseeing and coordinating the project's planning and implementation. The PSC consists of representatives of FAO, IUCN/GDI, GGW/Action Against desertification, MP Secretariat, PKH Secretariat and project beneficiary countries. Detailed PSC membership will be defined at project inception. The PSC is a collegial advisory body and its main functions are: (i) Provide guidance to the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) to ensure project implementation is in accordance with the project document; (ii) Review and approve any proposed revisions to the project results framework and implementation arrangements; (iii) Review, amend (if appropriate) and endorse all Annual Work Plans and Budgets; (iv) Review project progress and achievement of planned results as presented in six-monthly Project Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and Financial Reports; (v) Ensure that co-financing support will be available on time; (vi) Advise on issues and problems arising during project implementation; (vii) Facilitate cooperation between all project partners and facilitate collaboration between the Project and other relevant programmes, projects and initiatives in the country; and (viii) Approve ToR for midterm and final evaluations
21. The members of the PSC will each assure the role of a Focal Point for the project in their respective agencies. Hence the project will have a Focal Point in each concerned institution. As Focal Points in their agency, the concerned PSC members will (i) technically oversee activities in their sector, (ii) ensure a fluid two-way exchange of information and knowledge between their agency and the project, (iii) facilitate coordination and links between the project activities and the work plan of their agency, and (iv) facilitate the provision of co-financing to the project.
22. A **Technical and scientific resource experts group** will be set-up as well, and convened for international workshops in year 1 and 3 and consulted as needed in year 2 and along project implementation. It will provide scientific advice in defining domains of indicators, developing assessment procedures and manuals. The roles and responsibilities of the group will be defined during the first meeting.

#### **B.1.2 Stakeholder involvement plan**

23. The stakeholder mapping carried out during project preparation is presented in the table below, including their roles and participation in project implementation.

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Mandate</b>	<b>Role in project implementation</b>
<b>Global level</b>		
<b>FAO</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN and GEF implementing Agency</li> <li>• Knowledge management technical support and policy advice/advocacy for sustainable agriculture, NRM and food security</li> <li>• Coordinator and host of the Global Soil Partnership</li> <li>• Technical agency supporting land resources planning and management</li> <li>• Field programmes development and implementation</li> <li>• SLM and restoration</li> <li>• Mountains partnerships Secretariat</li> </ul>	Project Implementing Agency (see detailed roles and responsibilities in Section 4 of the PRODOC).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools and methods (LADA, Geonetwork, Global Land Cover Network (GLCN), Global Terrestrial Observing System (GTOS), Agro-Maps, Collect Earth, etc.)</li> <li>• Assessments, databases and maps; NR, land use systems, SLM practices documentation, application of tools in projects (LADA, Kagera, GGWSSI/Action Against desertification, global drylands assessments, Forest and landscape restoration monitoring and reporting tool, etc)</li> <li>• Policy legal and institutional development in food and agriculture sectors</li> <li>• Knowledge management and dissemination</li> <li>• Capacity development</li> <li>• Communications</li> <li>• Farmer and pastoral field schools</li> </ul>	
<b>IUCN</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International Environmental Organization</li> <li>• “helps the world find pragmatic solutions to our most pressing environment and development challenges”</li> <li>• Neutral forum for governments, NGOs, scientists, businesses and local communities on conservation issues</li> <li>• State membership to IUCN allow dialogue at the government level</li> <li>• Network and partnership with other organizations</li> <li>• Information sources on LD and SLM</li> <li>• Experience with local communities</li> <li>• Participatory assessments</li> <li>• Field experience in several countries</li> <li>• Global dryland initiative</li> <li>• Awareness raising</li> <li>• Advocacy</li> </ul>	Project Executing Agency (see detailed roles and responsibilities in Section 4 of the PRODOC).
<b>UNCCD</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN Convention</li> <li>• Established in 1994; sole legally binding international agreement linking environment and development to SLM</li> <li>• Core mandate has been placed on securing land productivity and resilience for the wellbeing of dryland inhabitants.</li> <li>• 10-Year Strategy (2008-2018)</li> <li>• SLM practices mainstreaming into policy, specifically in the arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas, known as the drylands.</li> </ul>	Global partner that will be involved during the two international brainstorming workshops. Will also be closely associated as a platform for policy discussion.
<b>Pastoralist Knowledge Hub</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultative platform for the pastoralist community</li> <li>• Training and capacity development</li> <li>• Learning exchange</li> <li>• Regional workshops</li> <li>• Community dialogue</li> <li>• Communication model to raise awareness</li> <li>• Advocacy to influence policies on behalf of pastoralists</li> </ul>	Will be closely involved in all the steps of the project and especially in disseminating the monitoring and assessment method under Component 2 of the project.
<b>Mountain Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN voluntary alliance of partners to improve the lives of mountain people and protecting mountains and environment</li> <li>• Hosted by FAO</li> <li>• Knowledge sharing network</li> <li>• Source of information, expertise and resources</li> <li>• Activities in Central Asia and the Andes</li> </ul>	Will be involved in the project essentially for dissemination aspects amongst various networks (Component 2).

<p><b>Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel Initiative</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• African Union Flagship programme that contributes to "a LD neutral world"</li> <li>• Many global, regional and sub-regional partners sporting and implementing projects: UNCCD (Secretariat and Global Mechanism) European Union (EU), FAO, United Nations Development Program (UNDP), UNEP, WorldBank (WB), GEF, IUCN, African Union Commission (AUC), CILSS-Aghrymet, OSS, IUCN, Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Economic Community Of West African States (ECOWAS), World Agroforestry Center, WOCAT Secretariat, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), etc.</li> <li>• Provision of technical and organizational Decision Support for SLM upscaling in selected countries</li> <li>• Partnership and knowledge Management hosted at the Africa Special Hub (AUC) Platform and supported by FAO and GM-UNCCD</li> </ul>	<p>Project team will closely be associated to the development and testing of the participatory LD and SLM assessment and monitoring system (Component 1) in the same pilot sites in Burkina Faso and Niger and with the beneficiaries of the EU/ACP Action Against desertification (AAD) project for sustainable land/forest management and restoration practices and technologies, and monitoring.</p>
<p><b>CILSS-Agrhymet (Niger and Burkina Faso)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional research centre (of the CILSS) providing information and training on Sahelian food security, desertification control, and water control and management</li> </ul>	<p>Partner of FAO in the project action against desertification, supported the development of national capacities.</p> <p>Provision of technical and organizational decision support in Niger and Burkina Faso as well as policy support in the region.</p> <p>Provides training in the use of Collect Earth.</p> <p>Supports the development of biophysical baseline assessments.</p> <p>In charge of the monitoring and evaluation of biophysical elements as well as the socio-economic aspects for the action against desertification project in Burkina Faso and Niger in collaboration with FAO, the Institut of Sahel of CILSS based in Bamako, FAO and Tuscia University.</p>
<b>National level</b>		
<p><b>Ministries and national departments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BF: General Directorate of pastoral resources management</li> <li>• Kenya: Directorate of Livestock Production</li> <li>• Kyrgyzstan: Department of Pasture</li> <li>• Niger: Ministry of Livestock</li> </ul>	<p>Operationalize national and regional policies on LD</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has endorsed the proposed project sites.</li> <li>• Ensure national buy-in and ownership.</li> <li>• Be informed of and associated to the development of the assessment and monitoring method.</li> <li>• Consider opportunities to i) harmonize approaches with existing methods; ii) integrate to international reporting requirement; and iii) institutionalize the proposed method.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uruguay: Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support access data (such as secondary data) to the project.</li> <li>Be closely involved in the policy aspects as part of Component 2.</li> <li>Be part of the project steering committee.</li> </ul>
<b>Local level</b>		
<b>Local government</b> (Dori in Burkina Faso, Marsabit in Kenya, Jungal district in Kyrgyzstan, Tillabéri in Niger, Basaltic Cuesta and East Hills Eco-Regions Governments in Uruguay)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision making process at local level in terms of land use management</li> <li>Implementation of good practices</li> <li>Source of investment for implementation e.g. personnel</li> <li>Source of information on state of LD</li> <li>Capacity building and technical advice</li> <li>Conflict mitigation</li> <li>Foster engagement with higher level government offices and other local authorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be closely associated in all project steps, and especially policy influence aspects.</li> </ul>
<b>Civil society</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representing community interests</li> <li>Influences policies at various levels</li> <li>Community mobilization and awareness raising</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will be identified at the national level before the national consultations as part of Output 1.1.</li> <li>Be associated to the consultations organised at the district level.</li> </ul>
<b>Local herders Communities</b> (Communities already supported by the baseline projects)	Grasslands and rangelands as their main livelihoods  Additional information on indigenous people is provided below, in the dedicated paragraph below this table.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source of information on LD status.</li> <li>Implement land management practices on a day-to-day basis.</li> <li>Source of indigenous knowledge on LD, SLM, landscapes and pastoralists' practices.</li> <li>Direct impact on grasslands and rangelands.</li> <li>Dissemination of information to other communities.</li> <li>Land monitoring.</li> </ul>
<b>Women groups</b>	Representing pastoral women	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information on how women's interaction with their natural resources.</li> <li>Ensure participation of women in planning processes.</li> </ul>
<b>Youths</b>	Representing young groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide information on natural resource use and motivations for migration into cities.</li> <li>Youth mobilization.</li> <li>Involvement of young people in training and uptake of SLM solutions.</li> <li>Training young people on various approaches and integration with local practices.</li> </ul>

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

24. The project will develop a procedure manual with a framework of indicators to enable the participatory assessment and monitoring of LD and SLM in pastoral areas comprising of grasslands and rangelands at a global scale. A long term benefit of this assessment and monitoring tool for LD and SLM in grasslands and rangelands would be to provide information on pastoral area management and allow local communities and policy makers to make informed decisions to reverse LD and promote SLM in pastoral areas.

**B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

25. Selection of a suitable method must be guided by realistic cost limitations. This does not mean the budget available in the project, but the likely resources that a government will allocate for adoption, scale-up and sustaining of assessment and monitoring approaches. A major factor in the current weak state of information on grassland and rangeland health is the cost of establishing and maintaining monitoring and assessment systems. Whilst the first impulse may be to gather the widest array of data possible, such approaches may be too costly to be scaled up and decisions may be needed over the minimum set of indicators to use. Indicators that are relevant for national level decision making may be unhelpful for the day-to-day management of grasslands and rangelands. Similarly, local-level indicators that can guide effective management decisions may be context-specific or simply too detailed and cumbersome to be useful for guiding national level decisions. The solution proposed by the project is an integrated, scalable approach within which appropriate indicators are chosen for different scales, but within a framework that allows a degree of comparison between sites and also that allows information at different scales to be cross-checked for cross-validation. The proposed project is considered cost effective in the sense that it aims at developing one holistic participatory tool to assess LD and SLM in pastoral areas that can be used at the global scale to allow comparison of assessments made at the local level.

**C. Describe the budgeted M&E plan**

26. The monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving the results and objectives of the Project will be based on targets and indicators of the Project Results Framework (Annex A of this CEO request and Sub-section 2.3 of the FAO GEF Project Document). Project M&E activities are budgeted at USD 188,000 (see Table below) and will follow FAO and GEF policies and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation. The Project Coordinator will prepare a draft M&E matrix that will be discussed and agreed upon by all stakeholders during the inception workshop. The M&E Plan will then be finalized by the Project Coordinator in the first three months of the Project Year (PY1) and validated with the PSC. A full description of the M&E matrix and plan is detailed in Sub-section 4.5.1 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

<b>Type of M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Time-frame</b>	<b>Budgeted costs</b>
Inception Workshop	PCU supported by the FAO LTO, BH, and the GEF Coordination Unit	Within two months of project start up – will be organised along the international workshop planned under Activity 1.1.1	USD 30,000 (budgeted under workshops)
Project Inception Report	PCU cleared by FAO LTO, BH, and the GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after workshop	USD 0 - project inception report is developed by the PCU.
Field based impact monitoring	PCU and FAO Liaison Officer	Periodically – to be determined at inception workshop	USD 30,000
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	PCU, FAO LTO and TCI/GEF Coordination Unit may participate in the visits if needed.	Annual or as required	The visits of the LTO and the TCI/GEF Coordination Unit will be paid by GEF agency fee. The visits of the PCU will be paid from the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports	BH with support from PC, with inputs from National Assessment Teams and other partners	Six-monthly	USD 0 (as completed by PCU)
Project Implementation Review report (PIR)	BH (in collaboration with the PCU and the LTO) Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	Paid by GEF agency fee
Co-financing Reports	BH with support from PC and input from other co-financiers	Annual	Completed by PCU and BH
Technical reports	PCU, LTO and uploaded on the FPMIS by the BH	As appropriate	USD 25,000 (Report compiling project's best practices and lessons learned)
GEF LD Tracking Tool	PCU and LTO	Updated at the time of the mid term review/evaluation and the final evaluation	USD 0 - data is collected by the PCU
Mid-term review/evaluation	External consultant, in consultation with PCU, GEF Coordination Unit, LTO and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 for independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budgeted costs
Final evaluation	FAO Evaluation Office (OED) in consultation with the FAOR/, GEF Coordination Unit and project team	At the end of project implementation	USD 55,000 for external consultant. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Final Report	PCU, LTO, GEF Coordination Unit, TCSR Report Unit	At least two months before the end date of the Execution Agreement	USD 8,000
<b>Total Budget</b>			<b>USD 188,000</b>

### **Part III Approval/endorsement by GEF operational focal point(s) and GEF agency(ies)**

#### **A. Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point(s) on Behalf of the Government(s)**

(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

N/A

#### **B. GEF agency(ies) certification**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation and Programme Management. FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		23.03.2016	Nora Berrahmouni, FAO Forestry Officer	+39 0657052938	Nora.Berrahmouni@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division. FAO				+3906 57055680	<a href="mailto:GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org">GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org</a>



## Appendices

## **Appendix A: Project Results Framework**

See Appendix 1 p.91 of the Project Document

## Appendix B: Response to comments received at PIF approval.

#	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
<b>STAP Comments</b>		
1.	<p>In the project description (A.1), STAP recommends defining clearly the problem statement, describing better the barriers and threats to sustainable agro-pastoral and pastoral systems, and how monitoring systems and participatory assessments can address the project objective on "improving the assessment capability and decision-making process" for pastoralists and policy-makers.</p> <p>In this regard, it would be useful to describe more thoroughly (and clearly) the potential drivers (direct and indirect) of LD and its adverse effects on ecosystem services (e.g. climate regulation, food provisioning) "basing the information on the target sites as much as possible". References (from published or unpublished sources) would be useful to support statements providing a general characterization of the effects of LD, or SLM, on ecosystem services.</p> <p>Furthermore, additional descriptions of the target sites would be valuable. This includes providing information on the socio-economic characteristics of herders/communities, agroecosystems (e.g. agro-pastoral, pastoral), and precipitation and temperature trends. Currently, some of this information is provided only for some African (target) countries, while there is no information in the proposal for Latin America or Asia "the other two target regions". One source of information for climate data is the "Climate Change Knowledge Portal": <a href="http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm">http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm</a></p>	<p>The rationale of the project has been clarified in Section 1.2. It now includes a clear description of the baseline in each pilot country, as well as a description of the remaining barriers to monitor and assess grasslands and rangelands LD and SLM.</p> <p>A table has been introduced in Section 1.1.2 describing the status, threats and drivers of LD in each pilot country.</p> <p>A description of the target sites in each pilot country has been introduced in Section 1.7, including a description of socio-economic and agro-systems characteristics.</p>
2.	<p>It is unclear from the problem statement and the interventions' descriptions how component 1 and component 2 link to address the project objective. At the moment, these two components do not appear to be complementary. It would be useful to detail further the rationale for component 1. For example, it is unclear from the proposal how the tools to analyse SLM, or LD, (component 1) will complement the monitoring system developed by component 2. The interconnection between both components needs to be described clearly and better linked to the problem, and project objective.</p>	<p>The project framework has been thoroughly revised to better link component 1 and 2 towards the achievement of the project objective.</p> <p>Component 1 now consists in the development of a participatory assessment and monitoring system for pastoral areas. Component 2 aims to inform international and national agro-sylvo-pastoral decision making processes, by compiling SLM local best practices and measures identified during the initial assessment</p>

#	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
		performed under Component 1 and by using these to inform tangible national policies, including through follow-up support that will be provided by the national partner organisations that will be closely involved in all project activities.
3.	<p>STAP recommends adding the development of a conceptual framework for the selection of indicators for pastoral and agro-pastoral areas. The proposal raises briefly the intention to develop an indicator framework (page 7) for pastoral and agro-pastoral areas. However, given the importance of developing a conceptual framework for indicator selection, STAP recommends adding this activity to the project framework and developing it further as a more prominent sub-activity of component 2.</p> <p>A comprehensive set of indicators that assesses the impacts of land management (pastoral management) on ecosystem services (global environmental benefits) at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales will require thorough analysis. In addition to comprehensiveness, the framework also will need to be flexible enough to adjust to the purpose of the assessment (including the appropriate scales).</p> <p>It is critical to first articulate the purpose of the indicator set: who will use it, and in what context. Comprehensive and flexible frameworks for indicators can contribute to the sustainability of the tool and its potential for scaling-up. The project developers may wish to rely on the following two sources when conceiving the conceptual framework, or for identifying scientific partners that can assist with this activity: 1) Niemeijer, D. and de Groot, R.S. 2008. A conceptual framework for selecting environmental indicator sets. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 8: 14-25. 2) van Oudenhoven, A.P.E., Petz, K., Alkemade, R., Hein, L., de Groot, R.S. 2012. Framework for systematic indicator selection to assess effects of land management on ecosystem services. <i>Ecological Indicators</i> 21: 110-122.</p>	<p>The first component of the project will support the development of a conceptual framework for the selection of indicators. This framework will include on the one hand a set of global domains of indicators to ensure comparability across countries, and on the other hand specific indicators applicable at the local level, that will be integrated in the global domains of indicators.</p> <p>The conceptual framework of indicators will be further discussed and developed during the international technical meeting to be organized through Activity 1.1.1. Among other, the framework of indicators will take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Driving forces, Pressures, States, Impacts, and Responses (DPSIR method),</li> <li>- STAP's Resilience Assessment Adaptation Transformation Assessment Learning framework,</li> <li>- Scientific recommendations from sources such as Niemeijer et al. 2008, and van Oudenhoven et al. 2012.</li> </ul>
4.	The baseline scenario needs to be described more thoroughly. Currently, there is only a brief narrative on the scenario. STAP recommends describing further the baseline scenario based on details relevant to the project sites. Additionally, STAP recommends curtailing the information describing the associated baseline projects, or providing this information in a more user-friendly way, for example in a table.	The baseline scenario has been clarified in Section 1.2.1. The baseline initiatives are presented for each pilot country in a synthetic but comprehensive manner. The baseline initiatives taken into account are more consistent and are now limited to the activities of the GEF project partners in each pilot countries.

#	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
<b>GEF SEC Comments 10 March 2014</b>		
5.	<p>Is the baseline project, including problems that the baseline project seeks to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> <p>Two main problems are identified (1) lack of process that transfers LD and SLM information to appropriate policies and legal instruments, and 2) lack of coherent indicators on multiple ecosystem benefits in grassland and pastoral areas. The baseline scenario includes a long list of projects, mainly managed by FAO, IUCN, IFAD and their partners on the considered issues.</p> <p><i>At CEO endorsement, reinforce the problem analysis and focus on a smaller number of projects to describe the baseline scenario.</i></p>	<p>The problem analysis has been reinforced in Section 1.1 and Section 1.2 and the number of baseline initiatives has been reduced to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IUCN - Global Drylands Initiative</li> <li>- FAO-FOR through EU-ACP project “Action against desertification in support of the implementation of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel initiative”</li> <li>- Pastoral Knowledge Hub</li> </ul>
6.	<p>Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p> <p>FAO works with various networks involving NGOs/CSOs (WISP, WAMIP, for instance). However, at <i>CEO endorsement please include universities and research/training centers in the considered countries. This kind of project is a unique opportunity to empower national and local scientific partners.</i></p>	<p>Yes, a specific sub-section is dedicated to this issue under Section 1.4 on participant and stakeholder analysis. The project is taking into account national and local scientific partners. Scientific experts from each pilot country will be part of the National Assessment Teams and will therefore benefit from capacity building activities on the assessment and monitoring process</p>
7.	<p>Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g. measure to enhance climate resilience).</p> <p><i>Provide a comprehensive risk assessment at CEO endorsement</i></p>	<p>A comprehensive risk assessment is presented in a risk matrix in Appendix 5 of the project document</p>
8.	<p>Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p> <p>The project is consistent and coordinated with other initiatives involving mainly FAO and IUCN. Other agencies as IFAD and some initiatives supported by bilateral partners are also mentioned.</p> <p><i>At CEO endorsement, please confirm the way this project will coordinate with these initiatives. For instance, the PRAPS and the Regional Sahel Pastoralism Support Project</i></p>	<p>The number of initiatives with which the project will collaborate has been clarified and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IUCN - Global Drylands Initiative</li> <li>- FAO-FOR through EU-ACP project “Action against desertification in support of the implementation of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel initiative”</li> <li>- Pastoral Knowledge Hub</li> <li>- Mountain Partnership</li> </ul>

#	Comment	Action/reference (references refer to FAO Project Document)
	<i>are mentioned in the PIF: during the PPG, please explore the best ways to coordinate and associate them (steering committee?)</i>	The national implementing partners will be part of the project steering committee to ensure good coordination.
9.	<p>Has cofinancing been confirmed?</p> <p>The project reasoning is built on cofinancing brought up by FAO and IUCN. The cofinancing amount is acceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please, confirm the cofinancing at CEO endorsement.</li> <li>- If possible, bring other partners to increase the cofinancing (WB, UNDP, UNEP, IFAD, AfDB, for instance).</li> </ul>	<p>Partners providing cofinancing have been identified and are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- IUCN - Global Drylands Initiative</li> <li>- FAO-FOM through EU-ACP project “Action against desertification in support of the implementation of the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and the Sahel initiative” and the “Global Drylands Assessment”</li> <li>- Pastoral Knowledge Hub</li> <li>- Mountain Partnership Secretariat</li> <li>- FAO AGPM</li> <li>- Uruguay</li> </ul>
10.	Confirm the countries that will be committed (the number of 9 is announced, but only eight countries are listed).	<p>The countries that will be involved in the project have been limited to 5: Burkina Faso, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Niger and Uruguay.</p> <p>Five main criteria were used to select the five pilot countries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The importance of the pastoralism sector;</li> <li>- The effects of LD;</li> <li>- Potential collaborations, leverage effects and cofinancing; and</li> <li>- The level of access to data.</li> </ul>

## Appendix C– Status of Implementation of Project Preparation Activities and the Use of Funds

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 100,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To Date/Committed</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Professional salaries	6,000	0	6,000
Consultants	42,100	39,701	2,399
Contracts	15,000	15,000	0
Travel	22,900	32,662	(9,762)
Workshops	14,000	624	13,376
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>100,000</u></b>	<b><u>87,987</u></b>	<b><u>12,013</u></b>

\*Please note that USD 12,013 will be used for preparation of the Inception Workshop.

