



CEO Endorsement (CEO) entry - Full sized Project Child – GEF - 7

Scaling up Cocoa-based Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration / Transformative Innovations in Côte d'Ivoire (SCOLUR-CI)

Part I: Project Information

Name of Parent Program

Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program

GEF ID

10247

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT No

NGI No

Project Title

Scaling up Cocoa-based Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration / Transformative Innovations in Côte d'Ivoire (SCOLUR-CI)

Countries

Cote d'Ivoire

Agency(ies)

FAO, UNDP, UNIDO

Other Executing Partner(s)

ICRAF, SODEFOR

Executing Partner Type

Others

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Biodiversity, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Productive Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Mainstreaming, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Tourism, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Forest, Forest and Landscape Restoration, REDD - REDD+, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Income Generating Activities, Ecosystem Approach, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Sustainable Livelihoods, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Demonstrate innovative approach, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Stakeholders, Indigenous Peoples, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, Type of Engagement, Consultation, Partnership, Information Dissemination, Participation, Communications, Public Campaigns, Behavior change, Education, Local Communities, Private Sector, SMEs, Large corporations, Individuals/Entrepreneurs, Beneficiaries, Gender Equality, Gender results areas, Access and control over natural resources, Participation and leadership, Capacity Development, Awareness Raising, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender-sensitive indicators, Women groups, Integrated Programs, Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration, Sustainable Commodity Production, Comprehensive Land Use Planning, Food Value Chains, Landscape Restoration, Integrated Landscapes, Deforestation-free Sourcing, Sustainable Food Systems, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Learning, Indicators to measure change, Adaptive management, Theory of change, Innovation, Knowledge Exchange, Knowledge Generation

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Submission Date

6/18/2019

Expected Implementation Start

10/1/2021

Expected Completion Date

9/30/2025

Duration

48In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

481,913.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
IP FOLU	Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.	GET	5,354,587.00	65,231,987.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			5,354,587.00	65,231,987.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To promote deforestation-free cocoa value chains and restore degraded cocoa-forest landscapes in Côte d'Ivoire.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Development of integrated landscape management systems	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 1</p> <p>Cocoa-forest landscapes managed sustainably with increased restoration for agriculture and environmental services</p> <p>Indicators:</p> <p># of ILM plans in place, informed by multi-stakeholder dialogue and cocoa platforms</p> <p># of ha of landscapes under improved practices in the 3 target regions of Indénié-Djuablin / La Mé, Cavally and Guémonas as a result of the adoption of the ILMPs</p>	<p><u>Output 1.1:</u> Multi-stakeholder dialogue and cocoa platforms strengthened to harmonize policies, actions, and catalyze investments</p> <p><u>Output 1.2:</u> Capacity building program, including tools and approaches to support implementation of ILMP implemented</p> <p><u>Output 1.3:</u> Integrated participatory landscape management plans developed and implementation overseen in the target landscapes</p>	GET	580,000.00	5,923,993.00

2. Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains	Investment	<p><u>Outcome 2</u></p> <p>Improved efficiency and sustainability of cocoa value chains</p> <p><u>Indicators:</u></p> <p># of new business models adopted based on improved climate resilient farming practices with innovative finance mobilized</p>	<p><u>Output 2.1:</u> Climate-resilient and ecologically sound intensification models promoted</p> <p><u>Output 2.2:</u> Innovative tools, approaches, strategies, guidance and training developed for more efficient and responsible cocoa value chains</p> <p><u>Output 2.3:</u> An inclusive business and finance model addressing, <i>inter alia</i>, enhanced participation and credit access among the poor, women and other marginalized groups), designed and pilot tested in at least one landscape</p> <p><u>Output 2.4:</u> Sustainable cocoa standards, certification and traceability systems developed and tested</p>	GET	2,387,607.00	24,712,530.00
--	------------	---	---	-----	--------------	---------------

3. Conservation and restoration of natural habitats	Investment	<p><u>Outcome 3.1</u></p> <p>Increased cocoa-forest landscape are under conservation and restoration.</p> <p><u>Indicators:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Area of degraded farmland and forest under restoration/rehabilitation and improved management. - Metric tons of CO₂e of GHG Emissions Mitigated 	<p><u>Output 3.1:</u> Institutional capacity for restoration and rehabilitation of degraded lands and forest habitats strengthened</p> <p><u>Output 3.2:</u> Highly degraded sites with in the pilot cocoa-forest landscapes restored</p> <p><u>Output 3.3:</u> Enhanced mechanisms to leverage investments and commitments for conservation and restoration of natural habitats</p>	GET	1,437,000.00	27,200,000.00
4. Project Coordination, Collaboration, Knowledge Management and M&E	Technical Assistance	<p><u>Outcome 4</u> Knowledge and innovation are diffused at multiple sub-national, national and international scales, while project implementation is monitored and evaluated</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> # examples of replication /uptake in regions of Côte d'Ivoire not among pilot areas of the CFI</p>		GET	695,000.00	5,424,994.00

Output 4.1: Knowledge products, tools and approaches, regarding target landscapes and change processes, developed and shared at landscape, national and international levels, through CFI, the FOLUR Global Program and other relevant platforms

Output 4.2: Participation of project team and partners in knowledge management and other activities of the Global FOLUR Platform, as well as in relevant international cocoa-related events

Output 4.3: Operational M&E systems implemented

Sub Total (\$)	5,099,607.00	63,261,517.00
----------------	--------------	---------------

Project Management Cost (PMC)

GET	254,980.00	1,970,470.00
-----	------------	--------------

Sub Total(\$)	254,980.00	1,970,470.00
---------------	------------	--------------

Total Project Cost(\$)	5,354,587.00	65,231,987.00
------------------------	--------------	---------------

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	MINEF SODEFOR	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,700,000.00
Recipient Country Government	MINEF- SODEFOR	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Civil Society Organization	IDH	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	262,000.00
Private Sector	World Cocoa Foundation Cocoa Forest initiative	Grant	Investment mobilized	48,000,000.00
Private Sector	World Cocoa Foundation Cocoa Forest initiative	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00
Donor Agency	Green Climate Fund (GCF)	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,400,000.00
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	200,000.00
Other	ICRAF	Grant	Investment mobilized	2,219,987.00
Other	ICRAF	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	50,000.00
Recipient Country Government	MINADER Conseil Café Cacao	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,000,000.00
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	Investment mobilized	100,000.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				65,231,987.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The project will mobilize additional investments both in the forms of new public programs - as indicated by the strong political will of the Government of Côte d'Ivoire to further invest in the sector - and through the private signatories of the Cocoa and Forests Initiative (CFI) and their Corporate Social Responsibility Programs. Private and Public signatories have committed approximately USD 50 million to be channeled through the CFI platform. Specific investments mobilized within, and also outside of, the CFI are as follows:

- World Cocoa Foundation, on behalf of leading cocoa and chocolate companies, will co-finance \$50,000,000 through activities and investments by the private sector as part of the Cocoa & Forest Initiative (CFI) in the period 2020 – 2025, in the targeted landscapes.
- SODEFOR will co-finance SCOLUR through activities of landscape management plans and agroforestry in two ongoing projects they execute in Cavally and

Guémon: a) Forest Investment Plan 2018-2023 with \$1,400,000 b) Resilient communities for better forest conservation 2020-2022 with \$1,600,000. • ICRAF (www.worldagroforestry.org) will co-finance \$2,219,987 through 2 ongoing projects concerning agroforestry : a) Sustainable Cocoa Communities in Côte d'Ivoire b) Agroforestry for sustainable cocoa and forest landscape in Côte d'Ivoire (AFS Cacao) and kind • IDH will co-finance \$262,000 through 2 ongoing projects concerning landscape planning and communication: a) Project for the protection/restoration of the Mount Péko National Park (establishment of the platform for dialogue and development and implementation of integrated participatory landscape management plans in the Guémon region) b) Green Growth Plan Implementation Project (Facilitation of the Cavally Dialogue Platform and Development and Implementation of Integrated Participatory Landscape Management Plans in the Cavally Region) • FAO will co-finance \$3,600,000 through GCF SAP REDD+ Project : "Promoting zero-deforestation cocoa production for reducing emissions in Côte d'Ivoire (PROMIRE)" and FAO direct technical and logistics backstopping (including one vehicle and in kind staff time). Landscape planning, agroforestry, forest restoration and communication will be developed in La Mé region.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
FAO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	312,351	28,113
FAO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2,278,199	205,038
FAO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Multi Focal Area	IP FOLU Set-Aside	1,295,276	116,575
UNDP	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	93,705	8,433
UNDP	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	655,937	59,034
UNDP	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Multi Focal Area	IP FOLU Set-Aside	374,821	33,734
UNIDO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	40,159	3,614
UNIDO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	189,373	17,043
UNIDO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Multi Focal Area	IP FOLU Set-Aside	114,766	10,329
Total Grant Resources(\$)					5,354,587.00	481,913.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)PPG Required **false****PPG Amount (\$)**

150,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

13,500

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
FAO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	12,500	1,125
FAO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	87,500	7,875
FAO	GET	Cote d'Ivoire	Multi Focal Area	IP FOLU Set-Aside	50,000	4,500
Total Project Costs(\$)					150,000.00	13,500.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 3 Area of land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	25000.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	20,000.00		

Indicator 3.2 Area of Forest and Forest Land restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	5,000.00		

Indicator 3.3 Area of natural grass and shrublands restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 3.4 Area of wetlands (incl. estuaries, mangroves) restored

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	514899.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

--	--	--	--

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

--	--	--	--

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	---------------------

	514,899.00		
--	------------	--	--

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title	Submitted
-------	-----------

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	0	4384300	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)		4,384,300		

Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	
Anticipated start year of accounting	2022
Duration of accounting	20

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		93,735		
Male		114,565		
Total	0	208300	0	0

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided

Estimation of core indicators is based on the following:

- **Indicator #3 - Area of land restored:** As shown in Annex L, the project will directly support agro-forestry-based restoration of 20,000 of croplands and 5,000 ha of forest lands, thus totaling 25,000 ha.
- **Indicator #4 - Area of landscapes under improved practices:** The three project landscapes cover 768,940 ha. Analysis of satellite data identifies two land use types where cocoa is grown: (1) coffee-cocoa (208,257 ha), (2) mixed cocoa areas (306,542 ha). Integrated landscape management plans will cover both land use types, for a total of 514,899 ha.
- **Indicator #6 Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated:** National and local institutions, local communities, NGOs and small-scale farmers will help deliver carbon benefits through the implementation of project activities. Estimates have been calculated through the EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) . The carbon-balance of this project amounts to -4, 384, 300tCO₂e for a total period of 20 years (4 years of implementation and 16 years of capitalization) and for a total area of intervention of 47, 297.64 ha or -4.6 tCO₂e per hectare per year. The project will expect to have spill-overs through avoided deforestation. The detailed lost areas can be found in the 'calculations' tab. Based on the Global Forest Change 2000 – 2019, Hansen, et al. 2019 the sum of projected lost area in the following four years (2021 to 2024) is about 94,641.96 ha; As a driver of deforestation, agriculture is known to contribute to 62 percent of deforestation in Cote d' Ivoire, out of which 38 percent of the sector's induced deforestation can be attributed to cocoa cultivation¹. Considering this, approximately 22,297.64 ha are expected to be deforested from cocoa cultivation in Cote d'Ivoire by 2024. In light of Cote d' Ivoire's Zero Deforestation Agriculture Policy aim by 2025² (2016), an ambitious assumption of 95 percent of avoided deforestation has been made for the target regions. This means that as a result of the project, 21,182.76 ha will be preserved from deforestation.
- **Beyond carbon benefit,** the project will provide multiple interdependent global environmental benefits. Through the Outcome 1.3 the project will promote SLM practices in the wider landscape (514,899 hectares) through the adoption of NRM guidelines and capacity development activities and promotion of SLM supply chains. During the project lifetime and in the future the areas of reduced deforestation will contain more biodiversity, provide more connectivity, regulate hydrological cycles, reduce erosion and store additional carbon. Furthermore, the process of reversing deforestation will not only continue for many years to come, but also expand in geographical scope to many other areas of Côte d'Ivoire.

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities

Private Sector Entities

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification*

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Medium/Moderate			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Environmental and Social risks

SCOLUR intervention is within the framework of national, regional and local policy priorities, civil society, and the private sector. As per the FAO Project Environmental and Social Screening undertaken at PIF stage and confirmed at CEO Endorsement stage, the proposed project falls into the MODERATE Category of FAO's Environmental and Social Risk Classification system. Table 5 provide a summary results from the Project Environmental and Social (E&S) Screening Checklist

Table 5: Summary results from the Project Environmental and Social (E&S) Screening Checklist

FAO Safeguards triggered	Risk category
ESS 1 Natural Resources Management	NO
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats	YES
ESS 3: Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	NO
ESS 4: Animal - Livestock and Aquatic - Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture	NO
ESS 5: Pest and Pesticide Management	NO
ESS 6: Involuntary Resettlement and Displacement	NO
ESS 7: Decent Work	YES
ESS 8: Gender Equality	YES
ESS 9: Indigenous Peoples and Cultural Heritage	NO

For those environmental and social safeguards for which potential risks may arise, a mitigation plan including detailed descriptions of mitigation measures has been developed and presented in **Table 6** below. In order to address FAO ESS7 specifically a child labor mitigation plan has been prepared. Furthermore, a dedicated Climate risk analysis and mitigation plan were prepared and attached and provided guidance to a coherent project climate rationale inspired by STAP principles and guiding questions.

Table 6: Environmental and Social Risk Management measures

Social & Environmental Risks and Impacts	Mitigation measures	Implementation Responsibility	Timeline
ESS 2: Biodiversity, Ecosystems and Natural Habitats			
Protected Areas, buffer zones or natural habitats Level: MODERATE Description: Though the intervention will be in the rural domain, the project will work around protected areas (classified forests) and to restore and increase land	Once the exact intervention sites within each landscape are known, the SCOLUR project will identify and assess potential project-related adverse impacts and apply the mitigation hierarchy so as to prevent or mitigate adverse impacts that could compromise the integrity, conservation objectives or biodiversity significance of the areas. It will undertake activities, appropriate conservation and mitigation measures, near buffer zones of protected areas or in legally designated protected areas, forests, biodiversity areas or buffer zones. The project will ensure that any activities undertaken are consistent with the area's legal protection status and management objectives, Forest restoration projects need to maintain or	Executing Agencies: SODEFOR, ICRAF. FAO, UNIDO, UNDP and Côte d'Ivoire Government to monitor on a 6 month basis	In the first 2 months of project execution, once the exact sites will be selected, ICRAF will be responsible for finalizing the site specific Environmental and Social Impact Assessment before any investment

scape connectivity.

enhance biodiversity and ecosystem functionality. Such mitigation measures will include:

- Intensive agriculture in proximity to preserves, parks, reserves, gazetted and sacred forests, protected areas and fragile ecosystems: Concerted actions will be implemented with protected area managers in order to strengthen the monitoring of these areas and reduce the various anthropogenic pressures with the following activities by the improvement of the producer's livelihood: stabilization of agricultural plantations, agricultural intensification, and promotion of agroforestry, community surveillance and monitoring, local development plans and communication / advocacy for behavior change. Also, as the forest restoration activities will be implemented in the buffer zone of these protected areas, these reforested area will become the barrier between the agroforestry activities / agricultural activities and the protected areas (as the monitoring and maintenance of the restored forest will be stronger, with the involvement of SODEFOR and local / decentralized forestry administration).

- Rehabilitation of cocoa plantations by introducing native trees (timber, firewood and fruit trees): Choice of species used will be left to small producers. For any intervention in the buffer zone of protected areas, the project will: (a) demonstrate that the proposed development in such areas is legally permitted; (b) act in a manner consistent with any government recognized management plans for such areas and ; (c) consult and involve protected area sponsors and managers, project-affected parties and other interested parties on planning, designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the proposed project as appropriate. Introduction of food crops and the valorization of other promising cash crops will follow and respect very strict conditions for species choice (use of native, local species and variety is better). Organic production gives more space to biodiversity and insects, for example, allowing the system to self-regulate. Increased vegetation complexity in agroforests, will harbor greater abundance and diversity of insectivorous birds enhancing pest control services. Training and awareness-raising of the stakeholders on organic cocoa production will help. Finally, the project can build on lessons learnt by La Mé region project in the choice of species to use as these crops have been in the

ent is made into the landscape.

Monitored during all the implementation

	e field for 5 years, showing it has few impact on environment.		
ESS 7: Decent Work			
<p>Child labour prevention and reduction</p> <p>Level: MODERATE</p> <p>Description: Child labour is defined as work that is inappropriate for a child's age, affects children's education, or is likely to harm their health, safety or morals. Child labour refers to working children below the nationally-defined minimum employment age, or children of any age engaging in hazardous work.</p>	<p>The SCOLUR project will comply with FAO Environmental and Social Management Guidelines (Standard 7) and FAO's Compliance Reviews (2015) describing the process and procedures related to alleged non-compliance with FAO's environmental and social policy standards, the FAO framework on ending child labour in agriculture. Non-compliance on child labor issues in accordance with the above policy frameworks will be highlighted specifically in the design of the project-level grievance mechanism for SCOLUR. FAO confirms and will monitor closely during the project implementation that beneficiaries that could potentially employ children below the nationally-defined minimum employment age^[1] will not be eligible as recipients of project technical and financial support.</p> <p>In the case of child labour in cocoa value chains, that is closely related with environmental degradation and economic (household poverty) and functional (harsh working conditions and labour intensive work) dependency of small-scale farmers upon child labour, the project intends to address this concerns with concrete measures integrated within the planned activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During the identification of the beneficiaries of the project, the criteria on child labor will be highlighted: beneficiaries who potentially use child labor for their production won't be eligible as recipient of project technical and financial support. <p>A child under the minimum age established in regard to the law will not be employed. The labor management procedures will specify the minimum age for employment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop and deliver child labour sensitive messages within its communication and outreach, as well as capacity development activities aiming at increasing safety in farm settings with specific messages about hazards and health consequences for children (see for example a typical visual tool used to raise awareness at community level on hazardous pesticides and child labour - http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3527e.pdf) opportunity cost and trade-off considerations related to child 	<p>Executing Agencies: SODEFOR, ICRAF.</p> <p>FAO, UNIDO, UNDP and Côte d'Ivoire Government to monitor on a 6 month basis</p>	<p>Rigorous application of the FAO framework on ending child labour in agriculture will be monitored during all the implementation</p>

	<p>d labour will be included in the implementation of the financial empowerment of the members of the producers' organization and cooperatives. Additional information is available at http://www.fao.org/childlabouragriculture/en/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project will set up a strong monitoring system with specific child labour indicators. For this purpose, the project will use the child labour monitoring system (<i>Système d'Observation et de Suivi du Travail des Enfants en Côte d'Ivoire - SOSTECI</i>) developed and institutionalized by the Government of Côte d'Ivoire in January 2020 (http://travaildesenfants.org/fr/dossier/sosteci) at local level (villages) which enables communities to collect and analyze statistical data on the worst forms of child labor, and also helps to ensure that this information is used for implementation of redress actions. The project will work with CSOs through "Observatoire Indépendant" for the monitoring of safeguards and with local protection associations for gender and child labour issue (training and awareness raising mainly). All communication tools and sensitization, which target also women, will be child labour sensitive. 		
ESS 8: Gender Equality			
Equal opportunities for men and women to participate in and benefit	<p>The PRODOC prescribes in several passages, that gender should be carefully considered during full project implementation, in particular in connection with stakeholder interactions and engagement.</p> <p>As for the current project design, at this stage moving from PIF to PRODOC for CEO Endorsement, all safeguards pertaining to gender have been put in place, and risks minimized – as follows:</p> <p>Regarding gender: A gender mainstreaming plan was developed on the basis of a project specific gender analysis.. This plan includes gender-sensitive indicators in line with the project results framework. The Gender Analysis and Action Plan is included as Annex J to this Project Document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several gender sensitive indicators were included in the Logical Framework. Safeguard 8 is based on FAO Policy on Gender Equality[2] and 	FAO, UNIDO, UNDP (project team) and Côte d'Ivoire Government, SODEFOR, ICRAF,	Checked during all the implementation

	<p>Safeguard 3 is based on the Policy on Gender Equality[2] and UNIDO strategy on gender equality[3], which establish a regulatory framework addressed to ensure minimal standards to integrate gender in a cross-cutting manner and interventions mainly addressed to women. Through the project, equal access to production resources, services and markets will be provided as well as to their control. In addition, the participation of women and men in decision making in rural institutions and political processes will be safeguarded, and it will be ensured that all the stakeholders equally benefit from the development interventions, and that inequality is not promoted or perpetuated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · This safeguard recognizes that gender equity is one of the main factors for the sustainability of the interventions in the agriculture and rural development sector. · The project approach will be sensitive to gender issues during its implementation by ensuring no discrimination of women or girls and gender equality. It will address the different needs and priorities of women and men promoting the effective participation of women in all the project activities and ensuring equality of opportunities for men and women in the participation and obtaining benefits according to the technical guide for governing land for women and men[4]. · During the formulation of the project, a gender analysis was conducted to ensure that needs and priorities of men and women will be considered during the implementation of the project and to identify potential risks, benefits and impacts in relation to production supplies, resources and services and participation in decision-making. In addition, the project will collect data disaggregated by gender and will record progress regarding gender mainstreaming. 	
--	---	--

[1] In Côte d'Ivoire, the minimum age of work is 16 years (Article 23.2 of the Labor Code; Article 16 of the Constitution and the minimum age for hazardous work is 18 years (Article 4 of the Prohibitions of Hazardous Work List):

[2] FAO Policy on Gender Equality <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf>

[3]https://www.unido.org/sites/default/files/2015-10/GC.16_8_S_Gender_Equality_and_Empowerment_of_Women_Strategy__2016-2019_0.pdf

[4] <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3114s.pdf>

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
Climate Risks Analysis and Mitigation Plan	CEO Endorsement ESS	
Child labour analysis and Mitigation Plan	CEO Endorsement ESS	
FAO ESS Screening_analysis	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Results chain	Indicators	Baseline	Mid-term target	Final target	Means of verification	Assumptions	Responsible for data collection
Objective: To promote deforestation-free cocoa value chains and restore degraded cocoa-forest landscapes in Côte d'Ivoire.							
Component 1: Development of integrated landscape management systems							
<u>Outcome 1:</u> Cocoa-forest landscapes managed sustainably with increased restoration for agriculture and environmental services	<p># of Integrated Landscape Management Plans (ILMPs), informed by multi-stakeholder dialogue and cocoa platforms, under implementation</p> <p># of ha of landscapes under improved practices in the 3 target regions of Indénié-Djuablin / La Mé, Cavally and Guémon as a result of the adoption of the ILMPs</p>	No planning at landscape level; little to no ongoing investment in restoration	ILMPs adopted at regional and/or sub-regional levels in 514,899 ha in the 3 target regions of Indénié-Djuablin / La Mé, Cavally and Guémon	<p>At least 75% of actions identified in ILMP for Year 1 and 2 implementation have been funded and are underway</p> <p>514,899 ha of land under improved practices in the 3 target regions as a result of the improved ILMPs</p>	Reporting by landscape platform committees	Agreed actions are well designed and effective in delivering sustainable restoration benefits	Platform technical committees, with support from project team
<u>Output 1.1:</u> Multi-stakeholder dialogue and cocoa platforms strengthened to harmonize policies, actions, and catalyze investments.	# of gender-balanced multi-stakeholder platforms covering forest and cocoa issues and operating at regional or landscape levels in four target regions	1 regional platform (Cavally) is operating	2 regional and one inter-regional / landscape platforms operational, with at least 30% participation of women, including at leadership positions	2 regional and one inter-regional / landscape platforms operational, with at least 40% participation of women	Reports of landscape platform meetings	Platforms are engaging with key stakeholders, including vulnerable and disadvantaged groups	Project team

<u>Output 1.2:</u> Capacity building program, including tools and approaches to support implementation of ILM, implemented.	Level of capacity to participate actively in landscape-level action plan development and implementation, particularly among disadvantaged groups	Limited capacities and understanding of landscape approach and of various technical aspects	Awareness raised and participation initiated among 90% of identified landscape-level stakeholders	Stakeholders representing a broad, gender-balanced range of interest, including those of disadvantaged groups, have demonstrated their capacity by participating in multiple platform and ILM P-defined actions	Project implementation reports; platform meeting reports	Platform members are effective in representing the interest of their constituencies	Project team
<u>Output 1.3:</u> Integrated participatory landscape management plans implemented in the target landscapes.	# of landscape-level partners (including governmental, non-governmental and private sector) coordinating and reporting on actions within landscape	Reporting on actions taken via CFI at national level lacks geographic specificity	At least 15 partners have reported on their contributions to implementation of one or more ILMPs	At least 25 partners have reported on their contributions to implementation of one or more ILMPs	ILMP implementation reports	Enhanced reporting / info. sharing is linked to enhanced coordination and synergies	Partners and project team
Component 2: Promotion of sustainable food production practices and responsible value chains							
<u>Outcome 2:</u> Improved efficiency and sustainability of cocoa value chains	# ha within project landscapes where various agroforestry models are planted and available to planters for demonstration / learning	Eight distinct models are available and known to experts and some practitioners, companies have made various demonstrations, but little synthesis or 'mapping' work done in landscapes	Well distributed set of known pilot areas for demonstrations across each landscape.	Agroforestry production models implemented across at least 20,000 ha, with each model well represented	Project team, landscape committees	Pilot areas stimulate additional farmers and financing sources to adopt and support models	Project team member (cocoa agroforestry expert)
<u>Output 2.1:</u> Climate-resilient and ecologically sound	Level of awareness of cocoa agroforestry	TBD (Survey to be conducted)	At least 30% of cocoa-growing farms	At least 70% of cocoa-growing farms	Platform technical committee	Farmer willingness to adopt	Platform technical committee

intensification models promoted	y models among farmers in production landscapes	d once travel restrictions are lifted)	ers are aware of at least three models	mers are aware of at least five models and 5-10% have visited pilot growing areas	e reports	dopt models not overly blocked by other barriers, e.g. financial	tee, project team
Output 2.2: Innovative tools, approaches, strategies, guidance and training developed for more efficient and responsible cocoa value chains	# of rural cooperatives and SMEs, each of which is operating in one or more of the target landscapes, capable and equipped to deliver a range of agro-forestry services to planters	10 cooperatives and SMEs capable and equipped to deliver agro-forestry services (est.)	20 cooperatives and SMEs	30 cooperatives and SMEs	Project reports including survey of SMEs and cooperatives	Farmer ability to pay for needed services	Project agro-economist
Output 2.3: Inclusive business models (addressing, <i>inter alia</i> , innovative finance, market access, IT, women empowerment) catalyzed and tested in landscapes	# of farmers adopting new gender-sensitive business models based on improved climate-resilient farming practices and innovative finance	Several approaches have been studied, but with limited uptake to date	Three new and innovative models are being tested (one per landscape), with at least 30% participation of women farmers	At least one new innovative business model has been demonstrated as feasible and is being taken up by an increasing number of farmers and their partners, including at least 35% women farmers	Project reports, including surveys of financial instrument application and use	Socially inclusive models are attractive enough in financial terms to stimulate change among potentially risk averse farmers	Project agro-economist
Output 2.4: Sustainable cocoa standards, certification and traceability systems developed and disseminated	# of landscape-level certification systems tested and landscape sustainability baselines measured	No landscape certification systems developed	One system assessed, landscape baseline assessment initiated	Landscape system ready to roll out; three landscape baselines measured and remedial measures identified	Landscape committees	Continuing demand and price premium for landscape-level certification systems	Project agro/ environmental economist
Component 3: Conservation and restoration of natural habitats							
<u>Outcome 3:</u> Increased cocoa production	Total area of degraded landscape	To be determined	2,500 ha	5,000 ha	Project report	Conservation	Project team

cocoa-forest landscape area under conservation and restoration	degraded farmland and forest in landscapes under restoration/	needed during inception phase			ing, reporting to landscape committees, satellite imagery and ground truthing	and restoration efforts are sufficient to reverse declines in ecosystem services	m
	Metric tons of CO ₂ e of GHG emissions mitigated	NA	438,427 Tons CO ₂ e	4,384,300 Tons CO ₂ e	Exact Analysis		Project team
<u>Output 3.1:</u> Institutional capacity for restoration and rehabilitation of degraded lands and forest habitats strengthened	Collaboration between SODEFOR (tree planting) and ICRAF (agroforestry) production landscape	The two entities have little experience working together, meaning that SODEFOR's silvicultural expertise is largely unused in the context of cocoa in the productive landscape	SODEFOR and ICRAF have tested their collaborative mechanism in the landscapes	Effective framework for collaboration has been demonstrated and is ready to be upscaled to other cocoa-forest landscapes	Project reports	Institutional cultures of SODEFOR and ICRAF are suitable for a longer-term collaboration	Project team
<u>Output 3.2:</u> Highly degraded sites within the pilot cocoa-forest landscapes restored	Area of degraded farmland and forest under restoration / rehabilitation via directly facilitated adoption	NA	1,000 ha	2,000 ha	Project reports	Climatic and other conditions remain conducive to restoration	Project team
<u>Output 3.3:</u> Enhanced mechanisms to leverage investments and commitments for conservation and restoration of natural habitats	Use of innovative mechanisms for conservation and/or restoration	NA	Three innovative mechanisms have been fully assessed for feasibility and pilot tested, at least two of which involve the participation of women's groups	At least one innovative mechanism has been demonstrated as feasible, the experience widely known and steps are being taken to support further uptake	Project reports, including agreements with institutions and/or communities	Governance mechanisms can ensure effective operation of mechanisms and associated incentives	Project team

			roups	ort further uptake		ves	
Component 4: Project Coordination, Collaboration, Communication and M&E							
<u>Outcome 4:</u> Knowledge and innovation are diffused at multiple sub-national, national and international scales, while project implementation is monitored and evaluated	Replication /uptake in regions of Côte d'Ivoire not among pilot areas of the CFI	Seven cocoa-growing regions are not included in the CFI pilot phase and risk further degradation and deforestation	At least three lessons learned / innovations have been identified and diffused within all seven additional provinces, raising awareness among key regional change agents	Adoption of at least one key lesson / innovation by opinion leaders and change agents in at least three provinces	Project implementation reports	Pro-innovation biases are systematically identified and avoided	Project team
<u>Output 4.1:</u> Knowledge products, tools and approaches regarding target landscapes and change processes, developed and shared at landscape, national and international levels, through CFI, the FOLUR Global Platform and other relevant platforms	Level of dissemination and uptake of tools and approaches developed by the project	NA	At least three documented examples of donors, companies and/or government partners who are actively taking on board approaches developed by the project	At least five documented examples of donors, companies and/or government partners that have taken on board / adopted substantial approaches or tools developed by the project	Project reporting	Adopted tools and approaches make a positive contribution to outcomes, compared with those being replaced	Project team
<u>Output 4.2:</u> Participation of project team and partners in knowledge management and other activities of the FOLUR Global Platform, as well as in relevant international cocoa-related events	# of Government counterparts participating in global, national and regional forums and workshops, along with FOLUR-supported Communities of Practice (total # of participants and % female)	NA	All relevant events are joined, with at least 30% female representation	All relevant events are joined, with at least 35% female representation	Project reports	Lessons being exchanged are relevant and can be adapted for local use	Project team
<u>Output 4.3:</u> Operational M&E systems implemented	Project team's ability to respond adaptively to unexpected changes in external environment	Baseline assumptions, knowledge and project strategy	At least three documented examples of strategy being adapted to change	At least five documented examples of strategy being adapted to change	Project reporting	Adjustments represent improvements over baseline	M&E specialist

	ronment		ed circumstances	nged circumstan ces		line strategy	
--	---------	--	------------------	------------------------	--	---------------	--

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Council comment (on PFD)	Responses (with respect to the Côte d'Ivoire child project)
<p>Germany Comments</p> <p>1) The [PFD] text systematically narrows landscape ecosystem challenges down to forest resources. Consequently, the lack of conclusive regulatory frameworks on soils and targeted incentives for sustainable soil management are not addressed in the [PFD]. Germany would like to suggest, that the vital role of soil ecosystem services are more specifically spelled out in the program description and analysis of root causes, and to include GSP/FAO in the list of relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>2) Furthermore, Germany would like to suggest stronger reference to Land Degradation Neutrality (SDG 15.3) targets and policies. The link of [the PFD] to the LDN conceptual framework (SPI/UNCCD) needs more systematic elaboration and should include an explicit reference to UNCCD as the custodian agency for SDG 15.3.</p>	<p>Declining soil fertility, due in significant part to full-sun cocoa planting practices, has been identified as a key issue in the baseline analysis. The project will coordinate with the National Agricultural Investment Program (PNIA2), which works to enhance and sustain soil fertility. More directly, Output 2.2, which is aimed at achieving more efficient and responsible cocoa value chains, will include support for Integrated Soil Fertility Management (SFM).</p> <p>2) Reference to and alignment with Côte d'Ivoire's LDN targets is included in the CEO ER. Through its interventions, the project will enhance and restore agro-ecological services and contribute to LDN in the target landscapes by both preventing and reversing land degradation.</p>
<p>Norway-Denmark Comments</p> <p>1) In our view this program seems to be a series of individual projects or activities which have been put together under one program. It is unclear how this is a program which has been built with the intention to tackle a specific issue or problem. The program tries to convert all the individual project activities into higher level outcomes.</p>	<p>Close alignment with the Global Knowledge to Action (K2A) platform project was sought during the Côte d'Ivoire child project development, including alignment of outcomes, outputs and indicators where relevant. Project M&E will be closely coordinated with the program M&E.</p>
<p>United States Comments</p> <p>1) Gender. It is insufficiently clear how the program will incorporate actions that will address the institutional constraints on gender equity and women's economic empowerment on the part of implementing partners (government agencies) and key stakeholders (non-gender oriented CSOs). For example, although the program expresses an interest in providing greater training of women and in increasing their number in leadership roles within groups supported by EOLIP, there is no mention of how government</p>	<p>1) A detailed gender analysis was conducted for the Côte d'Ivoire child project and gender actions incorporated into the project design. Please refer to CEO ER <i>Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i> and Annex J for details. Among others, the project's Gender Action Plan (see Section 6 of Gender annex) explicitly includes a series of output-specific actions related to gender.</p> <p>2) In the Côte d'Ivoire child project context, an important challenge is the ageing of farmers and the need to create incentives for young farmers to remain</p>

<p>y FOLUR, there is no mention of how government policies and practices (at the national or decentralized levels) will continue to support these initiatives upon the completion of the program cycle. There is also no mention of promoting gender sensitive procurement to encourage economic empowerment of women. Another concern is the gendered rates of literacy; if literacy rates are low, how will female small holder farmers be guided on how to read the labels of agro-chemical inputs so that applications can be applied in a safe and environmentally friendly manner? The issue of gendered literacy also extends to access to credit and land tenure (e.g. title deed s). What strategies are being considered to encourage best practices for measures to increase access to credit for female smallholder farmers and gender sensitive procurement? Finally, the sustainability/durability of interventions to incorporate gender equity and economic empowerment of women at the conclusion of the program cycle could be made clearer.</p> <p>2) Given the demographic changes in much of Africa and Asia, how will the program address the various constraints (financial, legal, etc.) that impede the ability of youth (18-25 years) to access productive inputs such as land?</p>	<p>ed to create incentives for young farmers to remain engaged in agriculture as a key element of sustainability. This makes youth an important category of project beneficiary and means that youth empowerment is an important consideration in the child project design.</p> <p>Each project component considers the role of youth, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Stakeholder consultation platforms will work with youth organizations (Outcome 1); · Sustainable intensification models will be youth and gender sensitive and business incubation platforms will also reach out to youth populations (Output 2.1); · Youth will be trained in forest restoration and conservation. (Outputs 3.1 & 3.2).
STAP comment (on PFD)	Responses (with respect to the Côte d'Ivoire child project)
<p>1) The STAP encourages additional quantification of key trends during the next phase of program preparation as a baseline from which to measure change, and further specification of the change mechanisms indicated in the theory of change, especially those essential to achieve scaling. The scale of outcomes is difficult to predict and highly dependent upon quality of stakeholder engagement processes at multiple levels. Given the geographic and commodity coverage of this IP, scaling up beyond country-level outcomes is integral to planned program-level outcomes, targeting fundamental transformation in food systems.</p>	<p>Detailed baseline information was collected on the policies, production and value chains of the target crops (rice, wheat and maize) in the target landscapes and provinces, and at the national level. Mechanisms for implementation and scaling up were identified through consultation with stakeholders and embedded in the project design and Theory of Change. In addition, Côte d'Ivoire will play a key role in transferring knowledge to other countries in the region and globally through the FOLUR Global Platform as well as other, existing platforms and mechanisms.</p>
<p>2) More detail should be provided during full program development regarding systematic risk identification and assessment of risk management options and strategies. [...] The PFD notes potential social and environmental risks posed by the country projects but does not specify these. While generic policy and governance risks are noted, there is inadequate explicit attention to political and economic interests that could (and are likely to) oppose desired changes.</p>	<p>A detailed analysis of risks was conducted during the project preparation phase (including climate risks), and mitigation actions identified. Details can be found in Section 5. <i>Risks</i> of the ProDoc,</p>

3) Gender equality aspects merit deeper analysis during full program preparation, particularly regarding barriers to gender-equitable resource access and tenure rights, and to inclusive decision-making in landscape-level planning and policy formulation.	As noted above, a detailed gender analysis was conducted for the Côte d'Ivoire child project and gender actions incorporated into the project design. Please refer to CEO ER <i>Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</i> and Annex J for details. Among others, the project's Gender Action Plan (see Section 6 of Gender annex) explicitly includes a series of output-specific actions related to gender.
4) Climate mitigation and adaptation goals are well integrated in the high-level program description, and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) practices and technologies are integral to the planned landscape-level responses. Yet, assessment of program-level sensitivity to climate impacts is not presented; more detail is expected in development of country projects and in program-level monitoring and targeted capacity support functions.	Climate risks have been considered in the project design (see Project risks table, p.80)

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
(5011) Salaries Professional	7.500,00	-	
(5013) Consultants	111.500,00	103.684,06	
(5014) Contracts	4.300,00	-	
(5021) Travel	13.200,00	13.858,13	
(5023) Training	13.500,00	7.226,10	
(5024) Expendable procurement	-	1.232,70	
(5028) GOE	-	1.304,17	
Total	150,000	127,305	22,695

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.

Please refer to maps and coordinates provided in section 1.b

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	M&E (4.3)	PMC	Project total
5011 Salaries professionals										
CTA/Senior sustainable cocoa expert	mm	48	4,000	-	30,000	15,000	17,020	25,000	104,980	192,000
Forestry specialist	mm	34	3,611	-	0	124,000	-			124,000
5011 Sub-total salaries professionals				-	30,000	139,000	17,020	25,000	104,980	316,000
5012 GS Salaries										
Administration and finance officer	mm	60	1,000	-	0	-			60,000	60,000
5012 Sub-total GS salaries				-	0	-	-		60,000	60,000
5013 Consultants										
Standards & certification expert	md	200	375		75,000					75,000
Value chains expert	md	75	400		30,000	-				30,000
Innovation and dissemination expert	md	150	400			-	60,000			60,000
Sub-total international Consultants				-	105,000	-	60,000	-	0	165,000
Platforms national advisor	mm	25	3,800	95,000	0	-	-			95,000
Restoration experts	mm	25	3,611		70,000	22,000				92,000
Sustainable intensification expert (Agroforestry among other practices)	mm	14	3,611	-	50,000	-	-			50,000
ILMP national advisors	mm	25	3,611	90,000	0	-	-			90,000
Implementation Capacity Development Specialist	mm	24	3,611	-	0	-	84,980		0	84,980
Standards, certification advisors	mm	14	3,611	-	50,000	-	-			50,000
REDD+/CFI/FOLUR M&E Specialist	mm	54	3,611	-	60,000	40,000	15,000	80,000		195,000
Value chains advisors	mm	12	3,611	-	45,000	0	-			45,000
Innovation and dissemination advisors (3)	mm	15	3,611	-		0	55,000			55,000
Site specific ESIA and monitoring	mm	5	3,611			-	-	18,000		18,000
Sub-total national Consultants				185,000	275,000	62,000	154,980	98,000	0	774,980
5013 Sub-total consultants				185,000	380,000	62,000	214,980	98,000	0	939,980

Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4	M&E (4.3)	PMC	Project total
5650 Contracts										
1 - Platform & ILMP development	Lump sum	1	280,000	280,000	0	-	-			280,000
2 - Meeting planning and org (non-platform)	Lump sum	1	80,000	80,000						80,000
3 - Intensif. models implemented landscape 1	Lump sum	1	80,000		80,000	-				80,000
4 - Intensif. models implemented landscape 2	Lump sum	1	80,000		80,000	-				80,000
5 - Intensif. models implemented landscape 3	Lump sum	1	80,000		80,000	-				80,000
6 - Criteria and indicators pilots (3)	Lump sum	1	120,000		120,000					120,000
7 - Economic modeling / feasibility (all landscapes)	Lump sum	1	158,546		158,546	-				158,546
8 - Financing solutions & capacity building (sustainable intens.)	Lump sum	1	185,917		160,917	-				160,917
9 - Restoration models implemented landscape 1	Lump sum	1	100,000		0	100,000				100,000
10 - Restoration models implemented landscape 2	Lump sum	1	100,000		0	100,000				100,000
11 - Restoration models implemented landscape 3	Lump sum	1	100,000		0	100,000				100,000
Land titling support for restoration models	ha	25,000	30			75,000				75,000
12 - Financing solutions & capacity building (restoration)	Lump sum	1	62,000		0	62,000				62,000
13 - Independent Evaluations (MTR and TE, Terminal Report)	Lump sum	1	97,000		0	-	-	97,000		97,000
14 - Knowledge & communications (CFI/UNDP GGP)	Lump sum	1	108,000		0	-	108,000			108,000
Translation cost		2	2,000		4,000	-	-			4,000
Third party Audits and spotchecks (through external audit firm)	Lump sum	1	90,000		0	-	-	-	90,000	90,000
5650 Sub-total Contracts				360,000	683,463	437,000	108,000	97,000	90,000	1,775,463
5021 Travel										
International travel- Participation in Regional commodity platform gatherings / discussions with private and public sector representatives / travels international trainers	trip	19	5000	-	20,000	13,000	50,000	12,000		95,000
National travel PMU and Technical cts	trip	131	1000	25,000	73,000	28,000	-	5,000		131,000
Travel for FOLUR GCP training/workshops & meetings	trip	8	5,000	10,000	-	-	30,000			40,000

5021 Sub-total travel				35,000	93,000	41,000	80,000	17,000	0	266,000
5023 Training										
<i>Detailed- show accomodation costs per training/workshop and/or meeting</i>				-		-				
Inception Workshop	Lump sum	1	8,000					8,000		8,000
Training on cocoa value chains	Lump sum	1	65,000	-	65,000	-				65,000
Standards and certification workshops	Lump sum	1	40,000		40,000					40,000
Capacity building on restoration	Lump sum	1	113,000	-	-	113,000				113,000
Sharing of knowledge products	Lump sum	1	30,000				30,000			30,000
5023 Sub-total training				-	105,000	113,000	30,000	8,000	0	256,000
5024 Expendable procurement										
Agricultural tools, fertilizers, plants and seeds	Lump	1	732,000	-	732,000	550,000	-			1,282,000
Other field supplies	Lump	1	210,000		210,000	95,000	-			305,000
5024 Sub-total expendable procurement				-	942,000	645,000	-	-	0	1,587,000
6100 Non-expendable procurement										
<i>Detailed- show identified procurement type</i>				-		-				0
Three-wheeled motorcycles trucks	Unit	8	3,000	-	24,000					24,000
Tree planting digging machines	Unit	6	1000		6,000					6,000
Moto	Unit	8	2,250		18,000					18,000
Nursery irrigation system	Unit	8	1,000		12,000					12,000
Solar powered-well	Unit	10	3,000		30,000					30,000
Vehicle	Unit	1	22846	-	22,846					22,846
C&I promotional materials	Lump	1	41,298	-	41,298	-				41,298
6100 Sub-total non-expendable procurement				-	154,144	-	-	-	0	154,144
5028 GOE budget										
<i>(Lump sum) misc. expenses</i>				-		-	-	-	-	0
				-		-	-			0
6300 Sub-total GOE budget				-	0	-	-	-	0	0
TOTAL				580,000	2,387,607	1,437,000	450,000	245,000	254,980	5,354,587

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit a finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agency is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).