



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

GEF ID:	<b>9135</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Ethiopia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Food-IAP: Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5559 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-3 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; BD-3 Program 7;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$100,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$10,239,450</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$144,965,431</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$155,304,881</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Alice Ruhweza</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>This is a child project under the Food Security IAP, for which the PIF stage was not required. We thank the Agency for this project offering a high standard. The use of RAPTA helped to structure the project preparation, and the collaboration with the STAP and Vital Signs were a real plus, especially for the component 3.</p> <p>UNDP is the Implementing Agency, will be part of the project board, and will also potentially be contracted by the government for direct project services: Could you please share the level of resources that will be used for direct project services? Are there any measures or safeguards to avoid potential conflicts of interest?</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Point taken.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>July 15, 2016 The project is aligned with GEF a number of strategic objectives. However, there are questions on the contents and the way to fill the different tables: - Table A: the table aims to provide information per outcome. Each</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>outcome should be presented with GEF financing and co-financing. please revise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table A: the project responds to 10 outcomes from the LD and BD objectives. It is a high number of outcomes. We invite the Agency to well check the nature of these outcomes and the requirements. We are not sure it is relevant to build this project under 4 GEF programs and 10 outcomes.</li> <li>- Table E: It seems there is a confusion on the requirement under some Corporate Results (CR).</li> <li>- It is not because the project is financed by LD and BD STAR allocations (triggering the IAP bonus) that you have to report on BD and LD objectives. Any IAP objective and program can potentially be used.</li> <li>- Most of the # of ha which are proposed in the project should be mentioned under the CR2 (# of ha under SLM in production landscapes).</li> <li>- The CR1 on improved management of landscapes should refer to the # of ha which help to protect global significant biodiversity, for instance to protect a Key Biodiversity Area. We did not find the information on the global significant biodiversity the project will help to conserve (either in</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the text or the tracking tools). The improvement of the vegetation cover is not enough to report under the BD4 Program 9 (this is probably why you faced difficulties to report the BD TT). Please, revise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The CR 6 has been designed to measure the Cross-Cutting Capacity Development program. We do not find enough elements to be fully convinced that this project will provide an integrated framework under the three conventions either for development, sectoral planning, or monitoring. Please, clarify.</li> <li>- We thank the Agency for the good mainstreaming of gender issues in a number of outputs. We agreed on the strategy to identify and reinforce women leadership, and their participation in processes and decision making. However, while the notion of inequality is mentioned in the chapter on gender, we would like to see an assessment or a study on this inequality and how it will be mainstreamed in the project (to improve women access to land, market, cash, business, etc.). Please address.</li> </ul> <p>November 18, 2016 Not fully addressed.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The GEF ID of this project is 9135 (9170 is the IAP ID).</li> <li>- Table A: Revise the table. Please provide one line per outcome showing the GEF financing and the cofinancing.</li> <li>- You mentioned in your response that the project was developed under the LD3 program 4 and the BD3 Program 7. However, the BD3 Program 7 has not been inserted in the table A. See also cell 6 "this project is no longer aligned with the BD Program 9. Please, make the responses consistent.</li> </ul> <p>December 20, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project targets 12 pilot sites. We wonder if the number is reasonable, and it is not a risk of dispersion of efforts. Under the component 2, it would mean around \$500,000 per site.</li> <li>- It is difficult to understand how the GEF resources are additional. It seems that all the project reasoning and the RAPTA are based on the \$11 million of GEF resources. Please explain the complementarity of the GEF grant with the \$144 million of cofinancing.</li> </ul> <p>November 18, 2016</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Addressed.	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>- See item 3: the risk of dispersal and transaction with the selection of 12 pilot sites should be included, potentially with monitoring and mitigation measures.</p> <p>- It is very important to find a way to measure and potentially anticipate the magnification of multiple risks in this kind of projects (climate change + population growth + food insecurity) and measure if the project will provide a response in the range of the risks and problems. Please, confirm.</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>- \$144 million of cofinancing in kind from the MEFCC is a huge investment, confirmed by a letter. We would appreciate an annex indicating a summary breakdown of how the amount will be delivered to justify "in-kind". This is needed to help us understand the country ownership, the baseline investments, and the added value of the GEF resources. Please, complete.</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Addressed.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>The two separate BD and LD TTs are not acceptable. Please use the consolidated template that was prepared for the IAP-FS and agreed by all agencies. In the process, please address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- check the number of ha mentioned in the result frameworks, the project document, and the different tracking tools and make the information consistent (BDTT: 120,000 ha of direct landscapes, 150,000 ha indirectly covered? LDTT: 120,000 ha of agriculture and 60,000 ha of pastoral lands? LDTT, LD1: 12,000ha? 60,000ha?).</li> <li>- FSC is mentioned in the BD TT, but not mentioned in the project document.</li> <li>- BD mainstreaming can be included if the project will demonstrate benefits for a globally important biodiversity, such as if the target geographies overlap with Key Biodiversity Areas.</li> <li>- Please include the coverage of ha of the considered KBA (if you cannot, do not make reference to the BD4 Program9).</li> <li>- LDTT: soil loss unit is tons/ha, please correct;</li> <li>- LDTT: We would like to see a minimum of information in the section 3 on the GEB: # ha of production lands with better coverage, eventually carbon information.</li> </ul>	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		December 20, 2016 The right tracking tools have been completed. Addressed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	We clearly see the linkages with the third component of the IAP and the partnership with Vital Signs. However, we are not seeing the same level of information about the linkages with the components 1 and 2 on the institutional frameworks and the upscaling aspects (AFIM for instance). Please, clarify. - Many very interesting aspects of this project would need a coordination with other initiatives under the IAP or beyond (output 1.2.1 on value chains, output 2.1.2 on microfinance and market access, 2.2.1. leveraging new partners). Please, complete. - The level of information about the executing authorities or the Scientific partners is detailed. We would like to see more information and clear commitment of CSO and NGO in the project implementation (it is mentioned that this listing will be completed at inception workshop, but we would like to see a list of CSO	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>and NGO who will potentially be associated to the project implementation.</p> <p>- For a project of this size (GEF \$11 million; cofinancing \$144 million), we would like to understand how the target of \$11 million of leverage in additional finance was calculated (attributable to the project).</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>Yes (please check the coherence of values between the request for CEO endorsement, the project document, and the TT).</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes, in the third component.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	<p>The project has been developed in collaboration with the STAP and the use of the RAPTA framework. However, the three following comments should clearly be addressed in a table:</p>	

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

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- The importance a comprehensive stakeholder analysis to develop an inclusive process (this comment is on the same line that GEFSEC and US Council member 's comment on the need to involve CSO/NGOs, including marginalized groups).</p> <p>- The STAP insisted on the need to strengthen scaling-up strategies in the design of projects. Please, explain how you developed the component 2, as well as sustainability aspects of these scaling up strategies.</p> <p>- Under risks, STAP suggests adding the challenges of scaling up technologies and practices, and how the project intends to reduce this risk.</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	<p>Please, provide a table of responses to GEF Council Comments made at PFD level (Canada, Germany, US).</p> <p>- Certain comments at PFD level have to be addressed at project level (land tenure, technologies, wood energy, ELD, programmes, inclusiveness).</p> <p>- There are also specific comments for the Ethiopia Child project (coordination with GIZ projects, irrigation, reference of key documents - Ethiopian Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management, Soil</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Fertility Research and Management Road Map, and Soil Sector Strategy, inclusion of marginalized groups).</p> <p>November 18, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>July 15, 2016</p> <p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the points above.</p> <p>November 18, 2016 All points have been addressed, but one. Please address the item 2.</p> <p>December 20, 2016 The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 15, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 20, 2016	