REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL
PROJECT TYPE: MEDIUM SIZE PROJECT
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Building the Foundation for Forest Landscape Restoration at Scale		
Country(ies):	India, Indonesia, Niger, Kenya, Ethiopia	GEF Project ID:	5775
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01265
Other Executing Partner(s):	World Resources Institute; Clinton Climate Initiative, World Conservation Unon (IUCN); Ministry of Environment and Forests (Ethiopia); Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change, State Department for Forests, State Department for Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperation (India); Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Indonesia); Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources, Kenya Forest Service (Kenya); Ministry of Agriculture (Niger)	Resubmission Date:	August 03, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of parent programme (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee (US$):	180,500

A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Financing ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
Land Degradation-3	GEF TF	$1,900,000	6,250,000
Total project costs		$1,900,000	6,250,000

B. INDICATIVE PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To contribute to the wider sustainable landscape goal and its interaction with the complementary strategies of avoided deforestation and climate smart agriculture.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
Component 1. Increased commitments to restoration	TA	1.1. Compelling analyses for improved decision making to support restoration is developed for each of the focus	1. Restoration Opportunity Mapping that quantifies the area of opportunity in each country based on the best local knowledge and science	GEF TF	579,048	1,600,000

		countries, including the number of hectares and expected benefits 1.2. Restoration commitments drafted and announced in target countries contributing to the Bonn Challenge goal of 150 million hectares in the process of being restored by 2020 1.3. High-level political commitment and cross-sectoral support for implementation of forest and landscape restoration actions in the target countries and emerging globally	developed, tested and applied in the candidate countries 2. Quantification of potential net economic benefits in the countries developed by analyzing the economic costs and benefits of the relevant restoration interventions in each country 3. Pledged contributions drafted to the Bonn Challenge (hectares) 4. Presidential decrees, parliamentary actions and/or inter-ministerial working groups drafted and structured in support of forest landscape restoration 5. Packages of mixed interventions to put landscapes back to work and solve difficult challenges of poverty, climate change, desertification and biodiversity loss prepared; where relevant, land use plans established for priority landscapes.			
Component 2. Enabling conditions between sectors in place to allow for large-scale restoration	TA	2.1. Tools developed, tested and applied at scale to support forest landscape restoration planning and implementation. Countries and institutions have easy access to these tools. Decision makers empowered. 2.2. Increased capacity of key actors and institutions to assess the potential for	1. Rapid Restoration Diagnostic[1] applied to assess the enabling conditions for restoration in each country, including custodial rights of local people, gender equity, poverty-forests linkages, and application of FPIC and social and environmental safeguards systems. Result is a detailed report to identify the gaps in the enabling conditions as well as strategic	GEF TF	760,000	2,630,000

		and implement forest and landscape restoration actions at scale	recommendations to address these gaps. 2. Strategies in Forests, Environment, Agriculture and/or Finance adopted to address the gaps identified by the Rapid Restoration Diagnostic 3. Policy-makers, thought-leaders and/or journalists participating in exchanges and training programs, with representation from across the forest, REDD+, climate smart agriculture sectors. 4. Technical exchanges between countries and at the sub-national level			
Component 3 Catalyze implementation and results, focusing on the areas of finance and monitoring	TA	3.1. Financial flows to accelerate the pace of forest and landscape restoration actions at scale identified in each country 3.2 Restoration monitoring system designed to provide transparency in the verification and reporting on forest landscape restoration progress globally	1. Restoration Opportunity Fund(s) designed (national and broader in scope potentially) 2. Restoration Finance Assessment conducted in each country to identify opportunities to align existing and new financing to restoration opportunities and to clearly highlight the positive and negative incentives for restoration. This includes identification of relevant financial institutions as well as potential sources of funds, grant and loan products, economic instruments and other incentives that could support restoration at scale, which notably will include the private sector 3. Method for establishing baselines and monitoring	GEFTF	470,476	1,700,000

			changes in biomass established			
			Sub-Total		1,809,524	5,930,000
Project management cost (5%)				GEFTF	90,476	320,000
Total project costs					**1,900,000**	**6,250,000**

1. Indicative Co-financing for the project by source and by name if available, ($)

Sources of Co-financing for baseline project	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount ($)
NGO	WRI[2]	Cash	900,000
NGO	Clinton Foundation	Cash	200,000
Bilateral	Norway/Norad	Cash	4,000,000
Government	Niger	In Kind	250,000
Government	Kenya	In kind	250,000
Government	Ethiopia	In Kind	250,000
Company	ESRI	In Kind	100,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	In kind	300,000
Total Co-financing			**6,250,000**

2. GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY[1]

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country Name/Global	Grant amount ($) (a)	Agency Fee ($) (b)	Total ($) (a + b)
UNEP	GEF TF	BD	Global	$1,900,000	$180,500	$2,080,500
Total Grant Resources				**$1,900,000**	**$180,500**	**$2,080,500**

A. **CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount ($)	Cofinancing ($)	Project Total ($)
International / national consultants	171,008	1,300,000	1,471,008
Local consultants	0	0	0
Total	**171,008**	**1,300,000**	**1,471,008**

B. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

---

[2] 400,000 USD funding from BMUB has been granted as co-financing for this project and is reflected as rolled up in WRI's own contribution

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

   A.   DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

A1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPS, national communications, TNAS, NCSA, NIPS, PRSPS, NPFE, biennial update reports, etc.

See Appendix 13: National Reports For Pilot Countries

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

NA

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

NA

A4. Describe the project baseline and the problem(s) that the intervention seeks to address:
NA

A.5. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning:

US$ 6,250,000 is provided in the form of co-financing, as presented in Appendix 2. The co-financing of the project has changed since the PIF was approved. In the PIF, it is stated that the co-financing would be $9.3 million, while the revised co-financing at CEO Endorsement is $6.2 million.

Financing for the WRI led (together with IUCN) initiative "Inspire, Support, and Mobilize Forest and Landscape Restoration" from BMU, previously reflected at $2.0 million is confirmed at $3.4 million for this referenced broader associated effort. Analysis of this funding best meets the GEF definition of associated financing, not co-financing, as such the BMU funds channelled through WRI in direct support to the GEF project activities are revised and reflected as $400,000. Notwithstanding, activities under the associated "Inspire" effort will greatly leverage and underpin GEF project's Component 1, enabling this Component to be delivered for less. As such co-financing for Component 1 can be lowered with the assurance that the outcomes can still be delivered at the updated co-financing levels.

From the five pilot countries, three have confirmed formal co-finance this project (Niger, Kenya, and Ethiopia) each on a 250,000 USD level, and the additional two are expected to confirm during the first 6 months of the project. Strategically, project start-up will not be impeded. During the engagement phase, all five pilot countries demonstrated progressively strong commitment to restoration goals.

New cooperative arrangements and support with CCI and ESRI were achieved during the preparatory phase of the project, with these two new donors contributing $200,000 and $100,000 respectively in direct support of the proposed GEF funded restoration activities in pilot countries.

Although the overall co-financing has been reduced, the ratio is at a healthy 1:3.2, and WRI is confident that the Outcomes as stated can be achieved.

A6. Risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:

The following risks have been identified, along with proposed risk mitigation strategies.

Risk		Risk Mitigation Strategy
Federal governments delay or decline to make Bonn Challenge commitments	L	Approach state government, civil society leaders and other champions who are dedicated to restoring ecosystems. For example, in Brazil, the civil society network called PACTO—who works to restore the Atlantic Forest—has made a 1 million hectare pledge to the Bonn Challenge though the federal government of Brazil has yet to make such a pledge.
Governments might delay issuing official letter to the Bonn Challenge commitment	L	Governments have sometimes made already internal pledges or policies and are reluctant to initiate official letter to international process with pledges, not clear what the pros and cons are and link to UNFCCC.
Lack of available data and information to conduct trusted analyses (geospatial data, economic data, sectoral strategies and plans, etc.)	M	In cases where key data or information is not available from traditional secondary sources, the project team will convene key informant interviews, focus groups and/or workshops to obtain the best available in-country knowledge on the topic.
Inability to engage beyond one ministry and sector	M	Align restoration as a strategy to achieve existing priorities in key sectors outside of environment, with focus on agriculture as the dominant land use in all the priority countries. Build the capacity of the team to include agricultural expertise and experience, while leveraging the growing capacities of WRI's growing portfolio of programmatic work on food and the World Resources Report.
Lack of willingness to revise land use planning to priorities forest restoration	M	Land use planning is usually a long process that involves different ministries horizontal and vertical that can take years
Assessment of enabling conditions reveals major obstacles to restoration scaling up	L	Work together with in-country stakeholders to define a portfolio of measures to address the gaps in the enabling conditions. Help to attract resources to address these issues by highlighting the potential opportunity and benefits of restoration.
Land tenure and property rights issues	L	Planting and use of trees is a long-term commitment with high upfront costs. Therefore local people need to be sure they can get the benefit, which needs to have some land use or land tenure rights
Land use planning uses a very heavy top-down approach	L	. Building sustainable communities requires a proactive, localized, and highly participatory approach that depends upon the unique role and capabilities of local government and the engagement of a wide range of stakeholders.
Social inequalities exacerbates	M	Project activities will be inclusive and planned to involve wide participation of all community members
Over the project period, countries likely continue experience weather variability, that may have deleterious impacts on ecosystem services over which land users have no control	M	Ongoing assessments will measure and take into account changing climate conditions, and project activities such as community land management planning and training in land management will be adapted based on these assessments.
Expansion of agriculture particularly unsustainable agriculture driven by the need to meet socio-economics needs and	L	There is need to support agricultural technological transfer such as seeds, smart agriculture, permaculture through provision of extension staff that assist in increasing production while restoration

no plans to restore lands		lands. This dual objective needs to be communicated well will restoration be a success
Cooperation between national and local government is not well regulated or coordinated	L	Devolution is very young in many countries thus that means that the smooth operation of the different ministry is still not well translated into appropriate devolution structure. The new structures are expected to pose a challenge in implementation.
The increase rate of population, which is challenging in terms of demand of productions against economic growth rate	M	It is notable that this growth rate, need to be matched with equal opportunities to reduce destructive activities such as charcoal burning. Investments or promotion of livelihood activities as forms of financing restoration activities such as nature based enterprise provide a window, which could be utilized by this project

A7. Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

UNEP is acting as the GEF Implementing Agency. WRI, as the Executing Partner, will provide overall management and oversight of the Project from its global headquarters in Washington, DC. A Project Steering Committee will be established to provide general oversight and guidance to the project's global and national components, facilitate inter-agency coordination and monitor global and national-level activities. The Project Steering Committee will be composed of a representative of UNEP Headquarters, the UNEP Task Manager, WRI Project Manager, WRI Project Administrator (Secretariat for the Steering Committee), and representatives of international organizations. The WRI Project Manager will report to the Steering Committee, which will meet periodically to supervise project activities and decisions. WRI's management role, led by the Project Manager, will be to review quarterly work programs, administer, oversee, and implement all project activities; provide financial management; monitor project implementation and outcomes; and ensure that project is delivered on time and on budget.

In the proposed intervention countries, World Resources Institute will approve and implement activities through its national executing partners (See Section 2.5 on key stakeholders, including Partner Executive Agencies in each pilot country). The project team will also work closely with relevant international and local NGOs, and major co-financers in a Steering Committee to provide guidance and facilitate cross-sector coordination. The GEF Implementing Agency (UNEP) will be part of the project Steering Committee and will also contribute to ensuring that appropriate linkages and coordination is maintained with relevant programs of all other relevant UN agencies, the UN REDD programs, the UN Finance Initiative, the UNEP Forest Group, the UNEP-UNDP Poverty and Environment Initiative, as well as with global environmental conventions and particularly with UNFCCC, CBD and UNCCD as well as the newly formed IPBES. UNEP and WRI have a long and successful history of productive partnership.

The project will explore linkages and lessons learned from the many existing initiatives and projects in each of the five focus countries targeted for project assistance (Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Indonesia, India). As a starting point, the documentation for this global project will be shared with GEF Operational Focal Points, and with all agency task managers of ongoing LD projects in the pilot countries.

IUCN is the Secretariat of the GPFLR and active members include but are not limited to WRI, PROFOR, World Bank, Tropenbos, Wageningen University, FAO, CBD Secretariat, ICRAF, IUFRO, UNEP and the governments of China, El Salvador, Finland, Ghana, Japan, Kenya and others. Through its active membership in the GPFLR, WRI will facilitate cross-coordination with the work programs of fellow members FAO and CIFOR.

GPFLR will be closely informed and involved in the GEF project. To ensure information flows form the pilot countries to the global GPFLR, WRI and GPFLR will convene three regional meetings designed to highlight issues and opportunities with restoration, raise its profile, and trigger follow-on processes. Convening will also be used to highlight success stories to educate others on "how to do it", and inspire replication.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 How stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

During the project preparation phase, WRI consulted with national-level stakeholders in each pilot country. This was done through the engagement of national consultants and the organization of stakeholder workshops at the national level. In India, an online survey was conducted instead of stakeholder workshops. In each of the five targeted countries, national consultants held numerous discussions with government decision-makers and technical specialists, and facilitated cross-sector meetings with resource persons and potential project partners. A wide range of stakeholder views were taken on board through the review of relevant literature and available documentation, and the organization of informal consultations, meetings and workshops. (See annexed national reports for more information).
At the global level, WRI engaged in discussions with thought leaders on forest restoration and national decision-makers gathered at the United Nations for the Ban Ki Moon Climate Change Summit in September 2014, as a prelude to the formulation of the UN Declaration on Forests. WRI was an active participant in the UNFCCC deliberations and shared information at multiple sessions of the Global Landscapes Forum convened in Lima in December 2014. WRI also played a key role in the workshops and meetings on monitoring of forests and trees outside of the forests, convened by the FAO in Rome in January 2015. In February 2015, WRI was also actively engaged in discussions of strategies for scaling up Climate Smart Agriculture during the work planning sessions convened by NEPAD and the African Union in Lusaka, Zambia, and again at the Global Forum on Innovations in Agriculture (GFIA) organized in Abu Dhabi in March 2015 on the theme of Climate Smart Agriculture. The project's design takes account of the conclusions and recommendations from these events on visioning, strategies and identification of priority activities for successful forest landscape restoration.

The remainder of this section presents information about key stakeholders and their relationship to the issues covered by this project, at both pilot country and global levels. It also outlines the ways in which the project plans to engage with stakeholders during project implementation. Additional details for each of the pilot countries, including groups of stakeholders engaged in the project preparation phase are in the annexed national reports.

Key categories of stakeholders include the following:

• **Governments:** Several governments are now encouraging restoration, which is reflected by commitments recently made to the Bonn challenge and by pledges made during the Climate Summit. The challenge remains to design strategies for scaling up existing restoration successes.

• **Private sector - Producing and buying:** Dozens of global corporations, from Disney to Unilever, and from McDonalds to their major beef suppliers in Brazil as well as palm oil producers in Southeast Asia have pledged to stop deforestation. Several of them, like Asia Pulp and Paper, have recently committed to restore degraded forests. But these companies often lack relevant restoration knowledge. Discussions with a number of these companies shows there is strong interest in collaborating with the Forest Landscape Restoration project and the Global Restoration Initiative team to address this need.

• **Private Sector - Technology:** ESRI is the leading software provider of spatial data analysis and storage. ESRI is a longtime partner of WRI that provides free access to their software that is used to store, analyze, map and monitor the

restoration potential in all countries. This software is used in all countries and ESRI can provide all partners that are interested the latest version and assists in analysis.

• **Private sector - Financial sector:** The restoration of degraded land requires investment. Sometimes this can be investment of labor by local communities, but successful forest landscape restoration at scale requires significant funding from both public and private sources. Private sector investment in restoration requires an assessment of costs, benefits and risks. Yet, the stakeholders in the financial sector do not always have the necessary data to do such an assessment. This project will involve private sector impact investors early on in the project and will specifically focus on the needs of these investors on risks, rate of return and other quality assurance indicators.

• **NGOs:** NGOs can play a vital role in mobilizing support at the local level for forest landscape restoration; some NGOs are also effective in working with governments and the private sector to undertake needed reforms to enable restoration at scale. The Greenbelt Movement in Kenya and World Vision Ethiopia are examples of NGOs involved in successful restoration. However, NGOs may lack the technical tools and expertise to guide and support restoration over large areas.

• **Local people / communities:** Large-scale restoration can only be achieved when hundreds of thousands of farm families in each country decide to invest in restoration. This requires simple, low cost and efficient techniques, which quickly produce economic benefits to land users. Local communities do not always have the necessary information, tenure rights and technical or financial support needed to invest in restoration.

• **Donors and policy makers**: These stakeholders can contribute to incentivizing and enabling implementation of forest landscape restoration through support for extension services, performance-based financing, trade policy, and development assistance. To be effective, donors and policy makers require timely and fine-grained information about options to restore lands and the anticipated costs and benefits. With improved information, donors and policy makers can improve the design and effectiveness of their interventions.

• **Researchers and academia:** Effective policy making is informed by good science and analysis. Much relevant research has been done on degradation and on specific restoration methods. However, major gaps in knowledge remain to be filled. For instance, little is known about the impact of agroforestry on surface and ground water hydrology and the multiple impacts of restoration have not yet been adequately expressed in monetary terms. With the implementation of the proposed restoration assessment methodology, spatially-explicit information on drivers and impacts will be generated to guide engagement in land use planning and to improve resource allocation for forest landscape restoration guide engagement in land use planning and to improve resource allocation for forest landscape restoration.

The partners in each country are a very important part of the success of this project. In the different countries the government partner is the "implementing" partner, the face of the project. WRI's role (in most countries with IUCN) is to push the government's agency own restoration agenda forwards, give advice, provide technical and policy analysis. WRI will further play the role of being the bridge between different ministries in-country. Different ministries and agencies often do not have the mechanisms in place to work together. As an outside organization, WRI or one of its NGO partners can play this important role. The different NGO partners in country are playing part of this bridge role or part of the technical, political or grassroots advisers to the government agency. See section 2.5 of the Project Document on stakeholder mapping and analysis which delineates roles of stakeholders. See Sections 3.8 and 3.9 on Sustainability and Replication which lay out a clear strategy of engagement with stakeholders in order to underpin and ensure these important factors.

Stakeholder engagement in project implementation will also be supported by posting reports, maps, and other information related to project activities, outputs and outcomes on the webpage for WRI's Global Restoration Initiative, and through the outreach activities of WRI's External Relations and Communications team. WRI's Global Restoration

Council will reinforce engagement of the global community of leaders committed to forest landscape restoration. At the national level, periodic meetings of national inter-ministerial platforms, committees and working groups will ensure that the interests of key stakeholders in restoration will be well represented.

See Table on page 22 of the ProDoc which provides a complete listing of the above described roles for different categories of stakeholders that are anticipated.

Stakeholder participation is vital for the success and sustainability of this project. As noted in the preceding section on stakeholder mapping and analysis, the forest landscape restoration project will work directly with a broad range of categories of stakeholders including government agencies, NGOs and the private sector. These stakeholders will have roles as implementing partners, consultative partners, and private sector partners. The government agency is supported to take the lead in the activities supported by WRI and other stakeholders. It is via the government agencies in the countries that most activities are implemented.

A key group of stakeholders will be women. The project recognizes the importance of gender analysis and mainstreaming attention to gender through the detailed planning, organization and implementation of this project. Project stakeholders--including national leaders and decision-makers in national ministries and lead institutions, local communities; and WRI partners in the pilot countries and the region -- will be consulted throughout the course of the project for their insight and feedback on project activities.

Participation will be enabled through short term training, cross visits and study tours organized with the support of the project, and through the capacity building and institutional strengthening activities support at the national, region and local levels. Local communities and their representatives will be engaged, encouraged and empowered to play a particularly important role in restoration activities, both at the grass roots and in different levels of planning and implementation.

Specific attention will be given to private sector investors. WRI learned from its 20 x 20 Latin-America restoration initiate that private impact investors are interested in restoration projects that improve agricultural or moniterizable ecosystems outputs. The success of including private investors in the 20 x 20 initiative from an early stage on will be attempted to emulate in this project. The project will include private sector investors, and put special attention to restoration possibilities that are interesting for these investors (including private company plantations). It is by combining public and private money resulting in improvements in public and private goods that this project aims to truly scale up restoration.

WRI has a special relation with FAO. WRI and FAO have been cooperating on restoration issues since a few years and have developed several side events together on restoration. Recently, FAO has developed specific tree monitoring tool that in cooperation with WRI is now used to monitor global tree cover in the drylands. This cooperation on restoration and tree monitoring will continue and further deepen in this project.

B2. 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). As a background information, read [Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF."](#):

WRI emphasizes institutional integrity throughout its own programming and that of project partners. Its mandate to advance sustainable development necessitates a focus on solutions that are sustainable from an environmental, social, and economic perspective.

Since its founding in 1982, WRI has worked to address key environment and development challenges in partnership with governments, civil society, and private sector partners. WRI's programming centers on accelerating restoration and

stemming deforestation; measuring, mapping, and managing water risks; advancing approaches to sustainably feed 9.6 billion people by 2050; peaking greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 and building a strong, low-carbon economy; accelerating the transition to clean, affordable energy; and shifting to livable, low-carbon cities for a growing global population. With partners, WRI has demonstrated the success of breakthrough ideas and scaled up these solutions for far-reaching, enduring impact in these areas. WRI has repeatedly been ranked the #1 Environmental Think Tank in the world by the University of Pennsylvania's influential "Global Go-To Think Tank Index."

WRI also holds its own operations environmentally accountable. WRI was one of the first non-profit organizations to measure its greenhouse gas emissions and implement absolute GHG reduction targets. The reduction targets for 2020 are ambitious, and include a 50% decrease from 2010 baseline electricity consumption, 20% reduction in business travel emissions, and a 20% reduction in other indirect (also known as "scope 3") emissions. In 2003 WRI was one of the first non-profit organizations to buy 100 percent renewable energy. WRI has tested the contents of paper products in its D.C., Beijing, and Mumbai offices to ensure its supply was sustainable, and adheres to a sustainable catering policy that sources primarily plant-based, locally-produced food and drinks to reduce the environmental footprint of meetings and catered events.

In this GEF project we will ensure that restoration is considered only on suitable lands. Suitable stands not only for environmental and economic suitable but also ecological integrity and social suitable. This means in the activities that in the component to identify lands available for restoration, biodiversity and ecological baselines are considered as inputs into the identification of suitable places. Social issues are considered in the regional to ensure that restoration activities adhere to free prior informed consent and other general accepted safeguards.

WRI also has strong social safeguard policies in place. Attention to good governance and issues of transparency, accountability, participation is a cross-cutting element of all of WRI's work. WRI brings deep expertise in advancing transparency and citizen participation in decision-making, land rights, natural resource user rights, and procedural rights. WRI has also conducted landmark analysis on and supported free, prior, and informed consent when it comes to decisions about people's natural resources. Prior to entering into any contract or partnership, WRI conducts rigorous due diligence, and all WRI contracts include clauses to prevent conflict of interest, bribery, and any direct or indirect support of "terrorists, terrorism, or other violent activity" on the part of contractors. WRI conducts a vetting process for new prospective corporate partners to ensure that partnership with the corporation would not compromise WRI's values or undermine its ability to achieve institutional objectives. The vetting process is rigorous and involves independent research, staff consultation, and review by WRI's Management Team. Sample contracts and copies of WRI's internal policies are available upon request.WRI has an anti-corruption, bribery, and conflict of interest policy requiring disclosure of any potential conflict of interest and prohibiting bribery, which all WRI employees must sign at their time of hire. WRI's Board of Directors and management team members renew this statement annually. WRI's whistle blower policy requires that all legal or ethical violations be reported, and protects anyone who reports a violation from retribution.

In accordance with the GEF Policy on GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards , safeguard measures will be built into national project design and implementation. Under this project, baseline assessment including socio-economics is part of component 3. This assessment will incorporate environmental and social concerns into the decision-making process. to ensure that particular attention is paid to environmental and social concerns with regard to the project interventions. Component 3 also a method will be developed to assess the result of the project which will also consider the implications of the Project for biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and on the creation of sustainable livelihoods. It will also ensure that the interventions identified in the Project components give due consideration the comments and recommendations of stakeholders and how these comments and recommendations are incorporated into the Project delivery. This will also evaluate opportunities to consolidate and implement other environmental and social initiatives pursued by local stakeholders, NGOs and other partnerships.

Paramount in the baseline and method to assess progress is the determination of the extent to which the Project will change prospects for biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use in the implementing countries. Key general questions, to be asked during the scoping exercise will include, inter alia:

• Will the project cause any loss of precious ecology, ecological, and economic functions due to construction of infrastructure?
• Will the project cause impairment of indigenous people's livelihoods or belief systems?
• Will the project cause disproportionate impact to women or other disadvantaged or vulnerable groups?
• Does the project include measures to avoid corruption?
• Will the project cause technology or land use modification that may change present social and economic activities?
• Are property rights on resources such as land tenure recognized by the existing laws in affected countries?
• Will the project cause social problems and conflicts related to land tenure and access to resources? Does the project incorporate measures to allow affected stakeholders' information and consultation?

It is clear from former smaller scale restoration activities in Niger, Ethiopia and other countries, that the socio-economic situation of farmers has spectacularly improved in areas that were restored. The assessment in component 3 is specifically designed to catch this improvement in order to further make the case for restoration. It is this socio-economic improvement that can convince investors, countries and donors to develop restoration at scale. Component 3 will thus focus specific on a robust socio-economic baseline and at end of project a new assessment will be carried out. The baseline will mainly be established from existing literature and projects. The analysis and reporting of the change in socio-economic situation will be one of the major outputs of this project.

Gender equity is an essential building block and enabler for sustainable development and is as such intrinsic to WRI's mission. WRI incorporates gender into its work to holistically address resource management and human rights challenges, and ensure that women and men participate in and benefit equally from sustainable development. Through rigorous research, WRI is bolstering the evidence base for addressing gender as a key dimension of environment and development initiatives.

Gender has been a feature of WRI projects on land, governance, transport, adaptation, and forests. An example is WRI's Access Initiative, which works to safeguard the rights of women and men to access information, participate in decision-making processes, and access justice in environmental matters. WRI is collaborating with local partners in Indonesia to analyze men's and women's participation in forest concession allocation processes. In India, WRI's cities and transport program is improving women's access to and safety in public transport and urban spaces. Gender specific activities are spelled out under Outcome 2.

WRI's Gender Working Group, a cross-program collaboration of over twenty-five experts and staff, leads and supports gender integration across the institute. WRI is in the final stages of recruiting a Senior Gender Advisor, who will provide in-house technical expertise in gender integration and will lead WRI's external engagement on gender and environment.WRI is also part of the Green Alliance for Gender Action, and through this partnership explores opportunities around participatory research and supporting local women's rights and environmental groups to increase their presence in policy processes.

In concrete this leads to three specific activities on gender. First to ensure that in the inspire part of this project women are represented in the Restoration Council. Second to create materials that specifically target women as practitioners. Women often have specific task in tending trees and crops. The different roles that different genders play will be looked into and specific outreach materials will be produced for each gender. This is linked to the third specific activity on gender, specific assessment and awareness building in the policy domain on the different roles that woman and men play in maintaining the landscape and restoration. This specific analysis and awareness raising and capacity building in the policy domain will be part of the diagnostic tool phase. These activities will assist in empowering women to play a more equal role in the activities and benefits from restoration.

The project has been cleared through the UNEP's Checklist for Environmental and Social Issues. In accordance with the GEF Policy on GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards, safeguard measures will be built into roll out of national pilots.

B3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:
WRI is committed to identifying and promoting the widespread use of alternative approaches to high cost reforestation, and to supporting low cost approaches to restoration that are ecological and financially sound, and that leverage local innovations and effective approaches for the mobilization of grass roots efforts to protect, manage and restore the productivity of degraded landscapes. The project design includes the analysis of the costs and benefits of restoration interventions, and the promotion of integrated approaches and sustainable practices for landscape restoration and management.

C. BUDGETED M&E PLAN

UNEP will be responsible for managing the mid-term review/evaluation and the terminal evaluation. The Project Manager and partners will participate actively in the process. The project will be reviewed or evaluated at mid-term. The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) or Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide an independent assessment of project performance at mid-term, to analyze whether the project is on track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required so that the project can achieve its intended outcomes by project completion in the most efficient and sustainable way. In addition, it will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools.

The project Steering Committee will participate in the MTR or MTE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An MTR is managed by the UNEP Task Manager. An MTE is managed by the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNEP. The EO will determine whether an MTE is required or an MTR is sufficient.

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. The EO will be responsible for the TE and liaise with the UNEP Task Manager throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes:

i. to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
ii. to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and executing partners.

While a TE should review use of project funds against budget, it would be the role of a financial audit to assess probity (i.e. correctness, integrity etc.) of expenditure and transactions. The TE report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the EO in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six point rating scheme. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the EO when the report is finalised. The evaluation report will be publically disclosed and will be followed by a recommendation compliance process.

The direct costs of reviews and evaluations will be charged against the project evaluation budget.

The GEF tracking tools are attached as **Appendix 12**. These will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.

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).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*
NA			

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**
Brennan Vandyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP	*Brennan Van Dyke*	August 03, 2015	Kristin Mclaughlin Task Manager	+1-202-974-1312	Kristin.mclaughlin@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE: To advance the building of a foundation for forest landscape restoration at scale in five pilot countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Indonesia, and India.)</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td colspan="3" align="center">OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS</td><td>VERIFICATION METHODS</td><td>ASSUMPTIONS</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT OBJECTIVE
To catalyze and support multiple processes designed to contribute to forest landscape restoration across millions of hectares by the end of 2020.</td>
<td colspan="3">Positive change in GEF LD3 scores and tracking tool:
  i. Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management
  ii. Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities
  iii. Increased investments in integrated landscape management

Value from restored forest landscapes
Area (in hectares) under forest landscape restoration</td>
<td>GEF Tracking Tool

National jobs data in relevant sectors; Revenue amount redistributed to communities, Poverty level data; REDD+ project benefit sharing levels; Other potential consolidated data from national and project surveys.</td>
<td>Partner executing agencies are committed to effectively and efficiently implement forest landscape restoration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes and Outputs</td>
<td colspan="3">Objectively Verifiable Indicators</td>
<td>Verification Methods</td>
<td>Assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td align="center">INDICATOR</td>
<td align="center">BASELINE</td>
<td align="center">TARGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</table>

Component 1: Increased political inspiration, support and ambitious commitments to forest landscape restoration/REDD+ actions in Ethiopia, Kenya, Niger, Indonesia, and India.	# of national, sub-national and sector plans, strategies and policies adopted that support forest landscape restoration	0	One adopted integrated forest landscape restoration plan for each country	Restoration policy analysis, tracking system and database	Adopted policies lead to implementation and enforcement
Outcomes: 1.1 Compelling analyses for improved decision making to support restoration is developed for each of the focus countries, including the number of hectares and expected benefits	# of compelling analysis presentations to decision-makers including the different roles that gender plays in restoration activities	0	Develop land use potential maps (5) and document successful cases of restoration (5) for each country	Presentation and outreach tracking system	Other barriers to research-based decision making are removed
1.2 Restoration commitments drafted and announced in target countries contributing to the Bonn Challenge goal of 150 million hectares in the process of being restored by 2020	Area of hectares committed to Bonn Challenge goal by each country	Ethiopia has committed 15M ha to the Bonn Challenge	100% of quantified areas for national and landscape level restoration adopted as commitments by each country	Documentation of pledges	
1.3 High-level political commitment and cross-sectoral support for implementation of forest and landscape restoration actions in the target countries and emerging globally	Increased political momentum to implement forest and landscape restoration	Political interest from key stakeholders and presence of enabling conditions	Country uptake and ownership of the restoration agenda through established working groups, committees and continued engagement	Documentation of public and private commitments	
Outputs/milestones 1.1.a Restoration Opportunity Mapping that quantifies the area of opportunity in each country based on the best local knowledge and science developed, tested and applied in the candidate countries	# of restoration maps produced	0 but in progress in Kenya and Ethiopia	6	WRI produced maps tracking system	
1.1.b Quantification of potential net economic benefits in the countries developed by analyzing the economic costs and benefits of the relevant restoration interventions in each country	# of analysis quantifying the economic costs and benefits of relevant restoration interventions (including the different roles that gender plays) produced by WRI managed funding	0	One cost and benefit analyses per country (5) and other analyses as needed to build economic case	WRI produced analyses tracking system	
1.2.a Pledged contributions drafted to the Bonn Challenge (hectares)	Same as 1.2	Same as 1.2	Same as 1.2	Same as 1.2	
1.3.a Presidential decrees, parliamentary actions and/or inter-ministerial working groups drafted and structured in support of forest landscape restoration	# of actions taken in support of or to advance forest landscape restoration	0 Kenya and Ethiopia have created working groups but not yet fully functional	One per country	High-level actions tracking system	

OUTCOMES AND OUTPUTS	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS			VERIFICATION METHODS	ASSUMPTIONS
	INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET		
Component 2: To create enabling legal and policy conditions for large-scale restoration, tools need to be developed, tested and applied at scale to support forest landscape restoration planning and implementation. Countries and institutions need to have easy access to these tools, suitable policies need to be adopted and decision makers need to be equipped with relevant information. Outcomes:	# of institutions systematically using WRI developed tools as part of their forest landscape restoration planning, decision-making and implementation.	0	(same as number of confirmed executing partner agency)	Annual interviews with executing partner agency	Removing all barriers to WRI developed tools use is within the scope of our work
2.1. Tools developed, tested and applied at scale to support forest landscape restoration planning and implementation. Countries and institutions have easy access to these tools. Decision makers empowered.	# of institutions using tools developed and tested by WRI to plan or implement forest landscape restoration	0	(same as number of confirmed executing partner agency)	Tool development and testing tracking system, google analytics, and institution use narratives	Tools and capacity building are what decision-makers need to plan and implement forest landscape restoration
2.2. Increased capacity of key actors and institutions to assess the potential for and implement forest and landscape restoration actions at scale	% increase in individual knowledge and skills through trainings and exchanges # of institutional capacity barriers addressed	0	Needs to be defined by Rapid Restoration Diagnostic report	Needs to be defined	
Outputs/milestones 2.1.a Rapid Restoration Diagnostic applied to assess the enabling conditions for restoration in each country, including custodial rights of local people, gender equity, poverty-forests linkages, and application of FPIC and social and environmental safeguards systems. Result is a detailed report to identify the gaps in the enabling conditions as well as strategic recommendations to address these gaps.	# of Rapid Restoration Diagnostic reports, tools, plans, recommendations, including differentiated recommendations by gender	0	9 (one diagnostic report per country and related plans, tools and recommendations)	Rapid Restoration Diagnostic reports	
2.1.b Strategies in Forests, Environment, Agriculture and/or Finance adopted to address the gaps identified by the Rapid Restoration Diagnostic	Ratio of strategies adopted (# adopted/#identified)	0	1 (all identified strategies adopted in each country)	Annual national level strategy tracking and review.	
2.2.a Policy-makers, thought-leaders and/or journalists participating in exchanges and training programs, with representation from across the forest, REDD+, climate	# of exchange and training participants (disaggregated by sector and gender	0	3 fora for Kenya, Ethiopia and Indonesia. Study visit in Niger and ROAM trainings and roundtable in	Participant sign in list and participant exchange or training evaluation	

smart agriculture sectors.		0	India		
2.2.b Technical exchanges between countries and at the sub-national level	# of exchange trips		2 (one in Kenya and India)	Participant sign in list and participant exchange or training evaluation	
Component 3: To catalyze large-scale implementation of forest restoration, financial flows must be identified in each country to accelerate the pace of forest landscape restoration at scale, and restoration monitoring systems need to be designed to provide transparency in the verification and reporting on progress with forest landscape restoration.	# financial or implementation barriers slowing the pace of restoration scale up addressed	0	5 (one per country)	Financial barriers addressed by (3.1) and observable smooth implementation	Most implementation barriers are due to financial, tools and capacity constraints. .
Outcomes: 3.1. Financial flows to accelerate the pace of forest and landscape restoration actions at scale identified in each country	# WRI actions to identify resources, convene key parties to build momentum, or advocate for resources	0	9 (one per country and follow-up actions as needed)	Documentation of financial pledges	Other factors will align with WRI's scope of responsibility to convene and inspire financial commitments.
3.2 Restoration monitoring system designed to provide transparency in the verification and reporting on forest landscape restoration progress globally	Progress around designing a restoration monitoring and evaluation system (**with specific attention to socio-economic monitoring and evaluation**)	No restoration monitoring and evaluation framework in any country	Multi-scale restoration M&E framework, system, protocol, one pilot of an M&E system that accurately reflects progress of forest landscape restoration, and accessible monitoring data on web portal	Completed restoration monitoring system	Partners will collaborate, adopt, and implement M&E frameworks as recommended by protocols.
Outputs/milestones 3.1.a Restoration Opportunity Fund(s) designed (national and broader in scope potentially)	Progress of establishing funds	No fund channeling money to restoration on the ground	Fund established	Functioning fund	
3.1.b Restoration Finance Assessment conducted in each country to identify opportunities to align existing and new financing to restoration opportunities and to clearly highlight the positive and negative incentives for restoration. This includes identification of relevant financial institutions as well as potential sources of funds, grant and loan products, economic instruments and other incentives that could support restoration at scale, which	# of finance assessments conducted	0	5 (one per country)	5 financial assessments conducted	

notably will include the private sector					
3.2.a Method for establishing baselines and monitoring changes in biomass established	# of method and protocols for monitoring changes in biomass established	0	1	Method and protocol document	
	# of plans for piloting a baseline using method and protocols above	0	5 (one per country)	Completed baselines for each country	
	Percentage increase in tree density as a measure of global environmental benefits		5 %	High resolution satellite and field assessment	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

GEFSEC Reviews		
		IA/EA Response
1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	March 24, 2014 This is a global MSP that will target five countries (India, Indonesia, Kenya, Niger, and Ethiopia), all of which are GEF eligible. Cleared	N/A
2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	March 24, 2014 The MSP is seeking only global set-aside funds from the LDFA. Cleared	N/A
3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		N/A
the STAR allocation?	March 24, 2014 No STAR resources are included. Cleared.	N/A
the focal area allocation?	March 24, 2014 A total of $2.085 million is being requested from the LD focal area, which is available. Cleared.	N/A
the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		N/A

the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		N/A
the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		N/A
focal area set-aside?	March 24, 2014 The full amount requested is available from the focal area set-aside. Cleared	N/A
4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	March 24, 2014 The MSP is aligned with the LD focal area strategy, and objective LD2 is identified as focus. However, given the focus on integrated management of forest landscapes (including agroforestry), please consider changing the contribution to objective LD3 instead of LD2.	April 3, 2013 The MSP is now aligned with LD3 as appropriate given its contribution to LD-3 Outcomes 3.1 and 3.3. This is now indicated in Section A1 5) GEBs and B2 GEF Focal Area.
5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	March 24, 2014 The MSP aims to build on existing commitments by five countries to increase area of forest landscapes under restoration through integrated management. It will contribute through increased information and analysis, which will be relevant to national land use planning and REDD+ discussions in other countries as well. In this regard, please clarify links to existing national	April 3, 2013 Section B1 on Pages 16 – 19 of the revised project submission contain an expanded narrative that highlights the baseline situation, which includes information on existing national plans, strategies related to international conventions (including NAPs) and the landscape of existing initiatives that could be engaged or leveraged during the term of this project. Note: this revised content in Section B1 consists of preliminary analyses that will be substantially built out during the preparation phase and term of this proposed project.

	plans, including the UNCCD National Action Programs (NAPs).	
6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	March 24, 2014 Although the gathering of credible baseline information is a key part of the project, some additional detail is required on the baseline situation as follows: a) In Section A.1 (1), please clarify human dimensions of forest landscape degradation (i.e. estimate of affected people) b) In the same section A.1(1), please clarify linkages to the UNCCD and its 10-year strategy c) In A.1 (2), please elaborate on relevant efforts that are underway or being planned to address gaps. d) In A.1 (3), please provide adequate justification for targeting the five countries, including clarification of the baselines to be transformed by the GEF alternative. What level of political commitment and ownership is there for the project?	April 3, 2013 a) Section A1 on page 6 includes an additional section that highlights the human dimensions b) Section A1 on page 7 includes the important reference to the UNCCD 10-year plan in addition to the existing references to REDD+, CBD and Bonn Challenge c) Section A2 on page 9 includes a reference to the specific baseline situation in each country. This reference points to Section B1 on pages 16 – 19 that details the overall situation in each country. d) Section A3 on page 10 contains five bullet points that highlight the top-level rationale for selecting the five focus countries for this project
7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	March 24, 2014 No, the project framework needs some work. Please address the following: a) Please provide a brief narrative to clarify each of the components. The content of Table B and text on Page 10 could be harmonized more to ensure consistency of outcomes and outputs	April 3, 2013 a) Table B on pages 1-3 was substantially revised to ensure that only outputs that can be measured and accounted for were included. A narrative to describe the high level framework in Table B can be found in Section A2 and A3 on pages 9 – 11. Revisions were made to ensure the content of Table B and the narrative on pages 9 – 11 were made consistent. b) Table B was revised to take this excellent suggestion into account.

	proposed. For example, output 4 under component 1, outputs 5 and 6 under component 2, and 2 under component 3 do not sound like outputs. Please include only outputs that can be monitored and measured or quantified for reporting purposes. b) Component 1- seems to largely focus on national commitments but Output 1.3 is more about planning and policy augmentation which may better fit as part of the Component 2 enabling conditions? Also Output 1.4 needs to be more specific. c) Component 2 - are these tools already developed and in use? Some further description of their status could be provided (perhaps through reference to available existing information), and additional detail of the final product these tools provide will sharpen these outputs.. Outputs 2.1 and 2.3 seem very similar, please differentiate. d) Component 3 - please explain how the private sector is involved. If large scale mixed restoration is to be successful the involvement of the private sector in the long term will be necessary. What private sector actors are considered potential partners? What incentivizes their participation in the project?	c) Table B was revised and narrative built out to avoid confusion between outputs related to the tools. Additionally, a footnote was added for the Rapid Restoration Diagnostic on page 2 to describe its current state of development and to provide a link to the latest version of the tool. d) The important role of the private sector as it relates to financing restoration was more explicitly referred to in Table B on page 3 and its corresponding narrative on page 11.
8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	March 24, 2014 Because this is a global project, GEBs are not explicitly identified. However, reference is made to alignment with GEF	April 3, 2013 a) A1(5) on page 12 was revised to be more specific and focused on the LD-3 GEBs accruing through advancing forest restoration

	priorities based on biodiversity, climate change mitigation and adaptation benefits. Yet these are clearly not consistent with the project approach. a) Please revise A.1 (5) to focus mainly on what can be possibly tracked at larger scale as a result of countries delivering on their commitments, such as improvement in tree and vegetation cover leading to measurable GEBs. b) With respect to incremental reasoning in A.1 (4), please start by referencing the UNCCD 10-Year strategy. c) Also in A.1 (4), please clarify how the project will specifically complement funding contributed by the Govs of Germany and UK.	policy and financial commitments b) A1(4) on page 11-12 was revised to include this suggested and important reference to UNCCD in addition to Aichi Target 15 c) A1(4) on page 11-12 was expanded to include the complementarity with the existing funding from Germany and the UK, which focuses on the utilization and improvement of tools required to champion and scale restoration globally
9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	June 23, 2015 No. This aspect of the project document is weak, especially given that a PPG phase presented an opportunity for detailed assessment. Please provide a clear description of how the proposed approach to building the foundation for global FLR at scale will help promote socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions. **July 20, 2015.** This issue is still not adequately addressed, and the attempt to do so as part of "Environmental and Social Safeguards" and "WRI's comparative advantage" totally misses the essence of	June 28, 2015 Please note the inclusion of country reports. Please note that aspects of socio-economic interventions and their expected impacts are now highlighted in Table 1 of the Project Document whereby socio-economic benefits will be specifically targeted and tracked as part of Outcome 3.2 (which is documented revised Table 1 and in the Results Framework) and elaborated in a new para in Section 3.11 as part of Environmental and Social Safeguards. Revised Section 3.11 of the ProDoc is replicated in Section B.2 of the CEO Endorsement Template for ease of reference. **July 30, 2015 EA Response** The following language has been added in Section 3.1 immediately preceding the table on Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs), pages 28-29. By applying approaches and tools that have been developed as

	this important GEF priority. For a global project of this nature, the most valuable contribution is demonstrating how socio-economic benefits can be delivered through FLR to support GEBs. This is not a safeguard issue, but rather an integral aspect of the overall approach to FLR. Please revisit and address this issue appropriately as a cross-cutting agenda in all components, and not just the monitoring system.	elements of the Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM) for analysis of FLR opportunities and implementation strategies in five pilot countries, the project will contribute to the improved understanding of the socio-economic benefits of FLR. Data will be collected and analyzed to model and validate the economic benefits of scaling up FLR successes, along with anticipated carbon benefits and financial returns of FLR investments. In addition, the project will identify and document key success factors in observed cases of successful local and national FLR initiatives, and diagnose policy reforms, institutional strengthening, capacity building, expanded communication an outreach and other interventions that are needed to enable and accelerate the scaling up of FLR. The analyses of economic benefits, key success factors, and enabling conditions and related recommendations will take account of gender dimensions and highlight the importance of attention to gender to the achievement of desired project outcomes.
10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	March 24, 2014

List of stakeholders provided is largely governmental. CSO and NGO need to be included in list of stakeholders as basis for enhancing public participation. Please make explicit the link to local groups and IPs, including in the target countries. The private sector appears to be absent. Finally, please provide a brief narrative on types of roles envisaged (i.e. Lead EA, Partner EA, etc.) to clarify the categorization of stakeholders.

June 23, 2015
No. Specific stakeholders identified at national level in each country, but evidence or clarity of means for their engagement is lacking. It would be more useful to get a bit more detail on specific | April 3, 2013

Section A2 on Stakeholder on pages 13 – 14 contains a revised list of expected stakeholders in each of the five focus countries.

Important note: it is expected that private sector engagement will increase throughout the term of this grant. There is an important role for agricultural companies, financial institutions and companies that offer spatial data and information. This is core to the in-country strategies, but is not reflected extensively in the table at this preliminary stage.

June 28, 2015

Stakeholder participation and anticipated roles has been clarified in expanded Section B.1 of the CEO Endorsement Template and revised Sections 2.5 and 5 of the Project Document. |

	value-added for their engagement, and how this will be assured during project implementation.	
	July 20, 2015 The resubmission does not provide any further details on "explicit" roles and "means of engagement" for the stakeholders identified. Please note that merely listing dozens of institutions and using single word descriptions of their role is not acceptable. We need to understand what exactly the partners will contribute and their role will be assured during project implementation. Please address.	**July 30 2015** Section 2.5 now focuses exclusively on stakeholder mapping and analysis, with identification of key groups of stakeholders. Section 5 includes 3 new paras (see below) outlining engagement of stakeholders vis a vis the project, as well as a definition of the roles assignments in the Table moved from Section 2.5. The participation of these stakeholders will occur at multiple levels, from the global to the national and local levels. At the national and local levels, key groups of stakeholders will have roles as implementing partners, consultative partners, and private sector partners. Government agencies contacted during the project preparation phase will be supported to take the lead in the activities supported by WRI and other stakeholders, as noted in the annexed National Reports. It is via the government agencies in the countries that most activities will be implemented in the pilot countries. Key stakeholders from the government and other implementing partners will be engaged to lead the activities of working groups organized to map restoration opportunities. Others will be engaged to provide data and to contribute to the application of the FLR restoration diagnostic tools in order to identify needed improvements in the enabling conditions for FLR. These key stakeholders will also be engaged through informal consultations, workshops and other means to develop capacity building strategies for FLR and to prepare national FLR strategies and plans. The project will also engage a selected number of key stakeholders to participate in international and national finance dialogues designed to mobilize financing for FLR from the private and public sectors. Finally, other key stakeholders, including representatives of local

		communities, will be engaged to participate in exchange visits and to take part in training programs to increase their awareness of successful cases of FLR and to share information about effective approaches to scale up FLR successes. Particular attention will be given to ensuring the participation of women and attention to gender dimensions. The roles of various stakeholders have been defined as follows: **Global Coordinating Entity.** GPFLR has a global mandate to coordinate FLR at the global level. **Consultative partners** are already working globally or nationally on FLR and will be consulted regularly in a collaborative context with respect to the roll out of the project. Some consultative partners are furthermore co-financiers of FLR globally and regionally. **Partner Executing Agency.** These are agencies at the national level, who have a lead role in joint decision making regarding implementation of country level activities, and participate in workshops and country level activities. **Partners.** These are agencies at the national level that are consulted and participate in workshops and country level activities. **NGO.** NGOs at the national level are called upon to participate in and co-lead project activities. **Private Sector.** Entities will be engaged in the identification of new sources of financing for restoration and analysis of financial viability of restoration investments, and in the identification of investment opportunities.
11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	March 24, 2014 Yes major risks and mitigation measures identified. Cleared	N/A

12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	March 24, 2014
	
	No. Two concerns need to be reasonably addressed:
	
	a) The PIF lacks adequate reference (beyond the India SLEM/CPP) to other relevant initiatives for coordination. Please provide a summary of other existing initiatives (including GEF projects) that are appropriate for coordination with the proposed project.
	b) The GPLFR has a key coordinating role and this needs to be further described. Additionally collaboration with REDD+ readiness efforts needs to be clear.
		April 3, 2013
		
		   a) Section B1 on pages 16-19 highlights some of the interesting and important work that is ongoing in each of the five focus countries. These preliminary narratives are not exhaustive but are indicative of the scale of existing initiatives that already exist in each of the countries that may provide opportunities for engagement
		   b) GPFLR has an important role to coordinate and communicate globally. This aspect is highlighted in Section A3 on page 9, in Section A6 on page 12 on scaling strategies and was added explicitly as a global partner in Table A2 on Stakeholders on page 13. In addition, collaboration on REDD+ readiness efforts indeed offer an interesting opportunity in each of the focus countries. The brief narrative regarding Indonesia on pages 17 – 18 highlight the importance of REDD+ readiness for the REDD+ Managing Agency. WRI is in discussions with the REDD+ Managing Agency at this time to identify specific collaboration opportunities in the 11 provinces in which they are focused (which account for 88-90% of land-based emissions in Indonesia).

13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**.
  Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.
  Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.
  Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.
	March 24, 2014
	
	The project is reinvigorating a much needed approach for forest landscape restoration, which will clearly enhance the LD focal area mandate. Part of the reason for slow uptake is that restoration has largely been done at smaller scale without real examination of the range of options, outcomes and methods available. Sustainability is largely based on the success of the tools and the ability to support implementation of restoration
		April 3, 2013
		
		Indeed, sustainability and scale are the focus of WRI's work on restoration. The intention to build strong demonstration effects in a representative set of countries. Section A6 on page 12 was expanded to include more detail on how these demonstration effects will be cataloged and communicated in the interest of inspiring a global movement for restoration.

	plans. Scaling up and roll-out to other regions and countries is a good possibility. Please clarify how preparation of and piloting of the tools in the five mentioned countries will serve as basis for rolling-out widely.	
14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		N/A
15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		N/A
16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 24, 2014 The amount requested and breakdown is fine. Please justify the sum for Component1 which is largely securing political commitment. Is there potential for private sector co-finance?	April 3, 2013 Component 1 was intended to include work related to "making the case" for restoration which ultimately is the only pathway to securing the commitments. Table B had erroneously cataloged these items under Component 2. We have fixed this error, which explains the substantial size of the budget for Component 1, as the GIS mapping and economics analyses are major efforts. Regarding private sector co-financing, there is potential for the in-country financial institutions and development banks to play an instrumental role in scaling up restoration. It will be optimistic to have new financing products and services rolled out in-country during the period of this grant, but WRI fully expects to have built relations and engagement with several private sector financial institutions as part of Component 3

17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 24, 2014 The co-financing amount and composition is fine. However, some contribution from the target countries should be explored. Please address. UNEP is contributing $300,000 in-kind support to the project, which is fine.	April 3, 2013 Table C on page 3-4 was revised to include an estimated in-kind contribution of $250,000 per government per year for each of the focus countries. This estimate is based on existing engagement between WRI and the governments of Brazil and Rwanda respectively, where progress and commitment from government stakeholders have both been substantial.
18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	March 24, 2014 Yes, PMC is 5%. Cleared	N/A
19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 24, 2014 PPG is within the norms. However, the amount needs to be justified in the text, including details of what will be achieved during the PPG phase. June 23, 2015 Report on activities was referenced but relevant reports (annexes) are missing. Please provide and also include summary of all meetings where WRI consulted with stakeholders on potential engagement in the project.	April 3, 2013 Some brief language summarizing the need and uses of the PPG has been included. June 28, 2015 Expansive and detailed country reports are provided as Appendix 13, which were not transmitted as part of original submission.
20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	N/A

21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	June 23, 2015 Please provide LD TT. **July 20, 2015** The TT is now included, but critical pieces of information related to knowledge products and knowledge management are lacking. This is exactly what global projects of this nature can contribute as "public goods". Please revisit and complete the TT accordingly.	Included. **July 30, 2015** The TT has been fully completed including sections 2. Co-financing from sectors 3. Knowledge application 4. Knowledge contribution as global public goods 5. SLM Learning
22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
STAP?		
Convention Secretariat?		
The Council?		
Other GEF Agencies?		
24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	March 24, 2014 No. the PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address all issues raised in the review.	
25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	April 23, 2014 Please ensure the following issues are adequately considered during development of the full proposal: 1. Approach to private sector	June 28, 2015 1. Engagement with private sector is enhanced and clarified in Sections 2.5 and 5 of the project document and re-referenced in the CEO Endorsement template, expanded Section B.1.

	engagement and anticipated roles during implementation, including potential for to leverage additional co-financing 2. Nature of populations affected by forest degradation globally relatively to scale of restoration potential highlighted in the proposal 3. Baselines in target countries, including planned and existing initiatives for effective coordination to maximize the catalytic effect of GEF financing 4. Clarity of how the project will contribute to monitoring of GEBs from FLR 5. Evidence of constructive engagement for collaboration with the GPFLR partners to facilitate cross-integration of work programs (e.g. FAO, CIFOR)	2. On page 14 of the ProDoc, a very rough estimate is made of the populations that could be impacted by the project's actions. 3. Baseline work is elaborated in Table 1 of the Project Document and in the Results Framework, Outcome 3 of the Project Document and in the CEO Endorsement template. 4. Please see new para at the end of Project Document Section 3.1 and revised output 3.2 in the Results Framework addressing monitoring of GEBs at a global scale. 5. IUCN is the Secretariat of the GPFLR and active members include but are not limited to WRI, PROFOR, World Bank, Tropenbos, Wageningen University, FAO, CBD Secretariat, ICRAF, IUFRO, UNEP and the governments of China, El Salvador, Finland, Ghana, Japan, Kenya and others. Through its active membership in the GPFLR, WRI will facilitate cross-coordination with the work programs of fellow members FAO and CIFOR. WRI has a special relation with FAO. WRI and FAO have been cooperating on restoration issues since a few years and have developed several side events together on restoration. Recently, FAO has developed specific tree monitoring tool that in cooperation with WRI is now used to monitor global tree cover in the drylands. This cooperation on restoration and tree monitoring will continue and further deepen in this project (see B.1 and Section 5 of ProDoc). GPFLR will be closely informed and involved in the GEF project. To ensure information flows form the pilot countries to the global GPFLR, WRI and GPFLR will convene three regional meetings designed to highlight issues and opportunities with restoration, raise its profile, and trigger follow-on processes. Convening will also be used to highlight success stories to educate others on "how to do it", and inspire replication (Section 2.7 of the ProDoc, and Section A.7 of the CEO Endorsement Template)
26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?	23 June, 2015 No, the MSP cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address issues raised in #9, #10, #19 and	Please see responses to 9, 10, 19, 21, and 25.

	#21. In addition, please note the following from the list in #25 for which the project document is still very weak: 1. Approach to private sector engagement and anticipated roles during implementation, including potential for to leverage additional co-financing 2. Nature of populations affected by forest degradation globally relatively to scale of restoration potential highlighted in the proposal 4. Clarity of how the project will contribute to monitoring of GEBs from FLR 5. Evidence of constructive engagement for collaboration with the GPFLR partners to facilitate cross-integration of work programs (e.g. FAO, CIFOR)	
First review*	March 24, 2014	
Additional review (as necessary)		
Additional review (as necessary)		

ANNEX C: **STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**

    A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW;

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **100,000 USD**			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	*GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount ($)100,000*		
	Budgeted Amount	*Amount Spent To date*	*Amount Committed*
International and Regional Consultants and Subgrants	65,000	31,713	53,414
Travel	10,000	4,687	10,186
Meetings and Workshops	25,000	0	0
Total	**100,000**	**36,400**	63,600

Note: Costs for country – level meetings and workshops with stakeholders were covered through the funds provided to national consultants.