



The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL IP)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10208

Countries

Regional (Cameroon, Central African Republic, Congo, Congo DR, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon)

Project Title

The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL IP)

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP, IUCN, UNDP, World Bank, WWF-US

Agency ID

UNEP: 01703

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

- However, we must admit that it is difficult to start the reading of the information provided in the portal with these codes, objectives, key words, etc. Please provide in annex a summary of the program describing 1) The environmental challenge (why do we need to save the Congo basin, the value for climate, rainfalls, biodiversity, water, livelihoods, economy, the status of science on the ecological functioning), 2) The objectives of the program and how this will meet the challenge laid out in 1 (meaning how the program is structured, what are the strategies that will be used, which countries are participating, what each one brings, etc), 3) The global/regional component/platform, what is its objective, what it will bring, how it will ensure that the program outcomes are more than the sum of the parts..., 4) The engagement with partners, institutions, the private sector, and 5) The expected outcomes from the main investments, what transformation is expected, what GEBs will be delivered.

- Complete this summary with a self-explanatory map highlighting the basin, the forests, the borders, the transboundary landscapes, and eventually, if feasible and readable the country targeted landscapes.

Thanks.

April 30, 2019

Please, include the revised summary and the map.

For the map 1: Please, 1) remove the names of the provinces, 2) include the limits of the transboundary landscapes using a single color, 3) include the name of these landscapes.

May 3rd, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

A summary of the CBSL IP has been compiled. Please see Annex I. Maps are provided under Annex A1: Program/Project Map.

May 03, 2019

A revised summary and a map with the requested changes have been included in Annex I.

May 07, 2019

Commitment deadline corrected to: 12/14/2020;

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Component 1: p.25 of the PFD: Component 1: there is a focus on land-use planning, but few mention of governance. P26, rather mentioning “clarifying roles”, I would suggest to include this aspect into a broader activity on governance.
- Component 2: Please, check the coherence of language between the program, the child projects, and especially the regional project: please, keep the broader language focusing on “long term viability of forests..... important habitat to endangered species and critical ecosystem services”... In the regional project, the component 2 is named “addressing wildlife crime and the conservation of Elephants and Great Apes”: it is too restrictive.
- General comment: In the text available in the portal, the PFD does not make reference to the regional project. The baseline situation is described for each country project, but the justification for the regional project is not given.
- The whole text in the PFD document should refer and reflect the regional project. This is the regional project that is creating the Program

The whole text in the PFD document should refer and reflect the regional project. This is the regional project that is creating the program.

- On the same line, we suggest to include a summary of all the child projects in the PFD document (Part II, 1a Program Description, section 5)).

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

- Added point (iv) strengthening land governance, in the same paragraph as a broader activity on governance.
- Component 2 of the regional project has been renamed "Targeted management interventions to provide safe and extensive habitat for stable and/or increasing populations of endangered species"
- In the latest version of the PFD "regional project" appears 17 times; the baseline description that precedes the country-by-country description is for the regional project
- A summary of all the child projects has been included in section 5.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- In the text field, please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent

expenditures", e.g. by summarizing the information available by child project.

- Please refrain from using "public investment" for co-financing from sources other than national and sub-national government authorities (see Equatorial Guinea).
- Please, confirm information for Republic of Congo: All the investments from the various ministries are under "Recurrent expenditures", except \$22.7 million from the Ministry of Finance which are defined as investments mobilized.
- Where co-financing truly meets the definition of "in-kind", it should typically be classified as "recurrent expenditures" rather than "investment mobilized". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).
- See for Gabon, the WB/Waves in-kind cofinancing is defined as investment mobilized.
- See for Cameroon, various NGO with a mix of grants and in-kind defined as investment mobilized.
- Please, only select one type of cofinancing in the country concepts: grant, or in-kind, but not both. Correct information for the regional project (cofinancing from GRASP and UNEP); Cameroon (government, various NGO);
- For Equatorial Guinea, we suggest to not list seven different partners for \$1 million of cofinancing at this stage. However, in the text, please explain the strategy, who you target, and the expected results. We invite IUCN to do a background check during the PPG and confirm the cofinancing partners at CEO endorsement. Please, note that six of these partners are private companies, one is a NGO.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

A concise description of the definition of investments mobilized in the CBSL program has been added in the PFD.

Public investment was only used for national and sub-national government authorities in the revised PFD.

The indicated government co-financing for Republic of Congo is correct and will be confirmed with formal letters during PPG.

All in-kind co-financing has been classified as "recurrent expenditures" in the revised PFD. Only one type of co-financing per amount has been selected in the revised PFD.

The co-financing for Equatorial Guinea has been revised and no longer includes the mentioned seven partners.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

Agency Response

Noted.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Six countries (Cameroon, Central Africa Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, and Republic of Congo) have programmed \$36,306,701 of STAR resources (project grants, PPGs, and associated fees).

Addressed.

Agency Response

Noted.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The Congo Program resources are provided by:

- Biodiversity (project grants: \$24,958,518 + \$2,246,267 of fees);
- Land Degradation (project grants: \$3,924,985 + \$353,249 of fees);
- Climate Change Mitigation (project grants: \$3,789,005 + \$341,010)
- \$636,392 from STAR allocations will contribute to the PPG to develop the child projects.
- The STAR allocations will provide \$36,306,701 (under the replenishment cap of \$36,590,717).

Addressed.

Agency Response

Noted.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response**Focal area set-aside?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The regional project is financed at the height of \$8,192,366 (project grant) + \$737,313 of fees.

A PPG of \$200,000 is planned (+\$18,000 of fees).

Addressed.

Agency Response

Noted.

Impact Program Incentive?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The IP incentive mechanism is used with the ratio of 2:1.

\$18,153,349 from the IP incentive are programmed.

This amount is under the maximum allowed (\$18,295,358).

Addressed

Agency Response

Noted.

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Please, address the discrepancies between the data available under the section on indicators, the text, and the country concepts.
- Please, provide the EXACT files, and a note to understand the parameters, the nature of activities on the ground, choices (for instance, default degradation figures versus Tier 2 local degradation), the assumptions (scenario with- and without-project deforestation rates, portion or totality of a targeted landscape to count in terms of improved practices or restoration, etc.). When the project activities include capacity building and technical assistance, the percentage of adoption of improved practices should be justified (100%?)

capacity building and technical assistance, the percentage of adoption of improved practices should be justified (100%).

- For the time being, we cannot accept the proposed values for Cameroon, the regional project, and Republic of Congo. Values for DRC are missing. Values for CAR are very low. More details about the EXACT files will be sent in parallel.

About the numbers themselves.

- Indicator 1: we found 10,398,461 ha; you wrote 7,890,301 ha;

- Indicator 3: OK;

- Indicator 4: we found 21,477,755 ha, you found 21,477, 255 ha;

- Indicator 6: we found 2,254,831,173, you wrote 2,251,831,173 tons of CO2

- Indicator 11: Gender

- We found 533,000 versus 511,000 beneficiaries (265,250 female versus 269,250, and 245,750 male versus 241,750). The difference of 22,000 equals the target for CAR. Please, confirm.

- For CAR, the proportion of male and female is not given.

- The information is missing for the regional project. We can understand the difficulty of estimation for the regional project, but a note on the way to go and the method would be welcome.

April 30, 2019

Thanks for the revisions and the excellent exchanges with the program team and the country project Agencies.

- Please, update the carbon values following our last exchanges on the EXACT tools.

- About the protected areas, please note that the correct name is Mwagne or Mwagna National Park in Gabon (Mwanga is in Tanzania).

May 3rd, 2019

Addressed. Many Thanks!

Agency Response

The core indicators (Table F) have been updated and information shared with the GEF reviewer. Annex J Assumptions underlying GEF 7 core indicator estimates have been added. EXACT files have been shared with the reviewer and can be shared again should it be requested. On the estimate of beneficiaries for the regional project, method of establishing accurate figures will be defined in the early stages of the PPG and shared with the GEFSEC.

May 03, 2019

The carbon values and other core indicator values have been updated through exchanges with the Country Project Agencies, the program team and the reviewer.

The correct title for the Mwagna National Park, Gabon has been provided throughout the PFD and the annexes.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Addressed.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, there is a analysis of problem (Annex D) and a Theory of Change (Annex E).

Please, be sure that all the annexes to the PFD are well logged in the portal (we only find them in the pdf document). Be sure that the titles of these annexes are self-explanatory.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

All annexes to be resubmitted using the portal.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

Agency Response**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

Agency Response**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

Agency Response**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

- All the child projects should be described in this section, including the regional project (there is no description of the regional project in the core document): The regional project should be the central part of the PFD and the entire rationale for the program.
- At the same time, we suggest to shorten the annex with the child project descriptions - 20 pages is longer than a usual PIF. We recommend to remove the tables on financing, or core indicators, and focus on the narrative part. Please, pay attention that the section 2.d. includes enough description of the components, outcomes, and results.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

- Explanations of all child projects including the regional child project have been included.

- PIFs will be shortened by removing the tables on co-financing and core indicators as these two aspects are reported combined in the PFD.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes for the indicators related to protected areas, restored areas, and areas under improved management.

Please see section I.6 about the comments on carbon calculations and numbers.

April 30, 2019

Addressed. See comment on carbon indicators.

May 3rd, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

Please see response in section I.6.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- There is a map for the basin and individual maps for the child projects: Please, check there is no duplication between areas covered by the country projects and the regional project.
- A map is missing: a map that would provide a summary of the CBSL Program in one picture: A map showing the basin, the forests, the country borders, the transboundary landscapes, and the targeted landscapes for investments (if feasible and readable). This map will illustrate the summary requested in the item 1, part I of this review.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

- The map does not duplicate areas covered by the country and regional projects.
- Please see the annex titled "Maps" for maps of the CBSL Program – having one map with all the information has been challenging, however the first two maps in the annex provides the necessary overview. More detailed maps will be provided during PPG.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

At this stage, the information provided on stakeholder engagement is fine. However, please address the minor issues below:

- In terms of policies, please, note that the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (not the Guidelines) is the one that determines the requirements that the Agency needs to comply with at different stages of the project/program cycle.
- Also, please note that the GEF Policy on Public Involvement in GEF Projects (GEF/C.7/6). Which is cited in the proposal, has been superseded by the Updated Policy on Stakeholder Engagement. It's advisable that the Agency reviews that Policy (GEF/C.53/05/Rev.01).

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

- Both these references have been corrected.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The gender issues are well incorporated at the PFD level.

Cleared.

Some observations will be shared to improve the gender issues during the PPG and the preparation of the child projects, especially the regional project, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, CAR and Gabon.

The project in Republic of Congo is a good practice example, with good descriptions of the gender context, an analysis, and project activities to address barriers to women's participation and decision making.

Agency Response

Thank you.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The section in the portal is very limited and does not reflect the ambition to (help to) set up better conditions for private sector involvement and transformational change. You need to revise the text and highlight how the program will work directly and indirectly with the private sector to support the Theory of Change:

- Directly with the non-extractive forest use sector, notably the Non-Timber Forest Products, with the objective to develop/promote sustainable NTPF value-chains,
- Directly with the tourism sector, and especially the activities around forests, biodiversity, and culture (ecotourism, fair tourism...);
- Indirectly with investments funds and partners as I&P to better understand the sectors, the potential for NTPF value chains, the barriers, improve the enabling environment, propose access to capacity development, markets, and financing.

- Now, the regional project should anticipate the future drivers and threats and see how to involve the big companies involved in palm oil, Hevea, and other commodities. These aspects are mentioned in the ToC, and should be included in the program and the regional project. Experiences in other regions, as the Amazon, could help.
- We noted that some logging companies are potential cofinancing in Republic of Congo with UNEP. The companies are well-known and FSC certified (CIB-OLAM, IFO). However, please confirm that GEF resources will not be associated to the exploitation of primary forests. It is a point to confirm for all child projects.
- Please, provide background information about Eco-Oil Energie; this company works in republic of Congo, in the area of the Lake Tele landscape, and is involved in the development of agriculture and agri-business based on oil palm and Hevea.
- UCN in Equatorial Guinea mentioned Chinese and Lebanese logging companies: Changxia, RMT, COMALI, SFMAL (SOFMAL?), MMS). Please provide some background information and confirm the absence of reputation risks.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

Please see revised section 4. Private Sector Engagement.

- Please see revised section 4. Private Sector Engagement.
- Please see revised section 4. Private Sector Engagement.
- Please see revised section 4. Private Sector Engagement.
- Please see revised section 4. Private Sector Engagement.
- Please see revised section 4. Private Sector Engagement – footnote has been added as follows “GEF resources will not be associated with the exploitation of primary forests”.
- Mention of Eco-Oil Energie has been removed from the child project PIF and the PFD – during PPG the private sector partners will be identified and reputational risks identified.
- Mention of the referred logging companies has been removed from the child project PIF and the PFD – during PPG the private sector partners will be identified and possible reputational risks evaluated.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The section on risks should be completed:

- We need to anticipate any reputational risks, and invite the different agencies to make a background check to avoid controversial groups, especially about logging or energy. For instance, IUCN in Equatorial Guinea mentioned Chinese and Lebanese companies we do not know. UNEP in republic of Congo mentioned an oil, energy, and agribusiness company in republic of Congo.
- In this complex region, we agree there is a need for political will and support, but the problems of governance, lack of governance, transparency, rule of law... should be clearly mentioned.
- Include a brief risk analysis at the regional level (political situation, conflict, violence, conflicting priorities with development sectors, agribusiness, mining, oil, transboundary water diversion (Lake Chad), etc); include environmental risks (climate, flooding for instance)
- The usual risks in project development are not included: capacities, procedures, financing management, the complexity to work in each country, recruitment, staffing, resistance of other sectors, difficulties to implement integration/transformation...
- Now, there are specific risks related to the development and management of such program at the scale of a basin, with six countries and several landscapes (transaction costs, capacities and willingness of countries to work together, etc). Include some mitigation measures (building on existing initiatives, avoiding duplication, including sustainability aspects, preferring internet and web-solutions).
- All the risks should be rated (high, medium, low), with some mitigation measures.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

Please see revised section 5. Risks.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- The list of partners and institutions is good. However, more information on the dynamics between these stakeholders would be welcome
- The diagram on the institutional structure needs to be revised. At this stage, we would recommend to not mention the partners in each national project steering committee – rules and practices may differ depending on the country and the GEF Agency.
- National and local authorities should be empowered in view of sustainability.
- The notion of platform should be introduced for the different components and sub-components of the program and the regional project (and developed during the PPG). As far as possible, it is recommended to build on existing platforms (COMIFAC, ECCAS, CEFDHAC, REPALEAC...). However, in view of integration, transformation, and innovation, virtual platforms may be developed, for instance on the private sector and the risks of agribusiness, or to connect different stakeholders and authorities on land-use planning. About poaching and trafficking, the Global Wildlife Programme should provide the global platform.
- The coordination with existing initiatives and institutions should be developed (REDD+, with the associated funds -FCPF, FIP, CAFI; on conservation issues with the different specialized NGO in addition to the GEF Agencies -WCS, TNC, CI; on Forest Dependent communities issues; on the Private Sector.

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

- Please see revised section 6. Coordination.
- The box on national project steering committees has been revised in the figure by removing mention of specific partners.

- National and local authorities will be part of the steering committee (this is mentioned in the text but not in the diagram).
- Please see revised section 6. Coordination.
- Please see revised section 6. Coordination.

May 07, 2019

Other executing partners name inserted.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The regional and national strategies, documents, and plans are listed in the PFD.

There is a strong country ownership (motion of support written and signed by the GEF OFP in June 2017 during the replenishment, Regional consultation in Libreville in January 2019). The proposed program is at the nexus of several international agreements for the environment, including the Rio Conventions, and the respective strategies and plans (NDC, NBSAP, NAP...).

Addressed.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

To be revised:

- Please, remind the KM process applied during the program development (TAG, side-events, high-level roundtable, regional consultation).
- Please reflect the following arrangements in the text: 1) KM is mainstreamed in the different components of the program, 2) there is a specific component on KM, and 3) the regional project will have a major role on KM.
- Confirm that the platforms and mechanisms will preferentially use existing and sustainable entities.
- Please, include a section on strategic communication (cf. mention the communication and outreach strategy, the partnerships engagement strategy, as well as the information system and web portal included in the fifth component of the regional project).

April 30, 2019

Addressed.

Agency Response

Please see revised section 8. Knowledge Management.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- Six letters of endorsement are available, signed by the GEF OFP.

Addressed.

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

May 3rd, 2019

All comments have been addressed, but some issues have been identified in the portal:

- 1) Please correct the program commitment deadline: it is still shown as 1/31/2021 in the Portal, and should be corrected to 12/14/2020;
- 2) Other executing partners name is still missing.

When these changes will be made, the PFD will be recommended for clearance.

May 7, 2019

The PFD is recommended for clearance and Work Plan inclusion.

Cover Memo for the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscape Impact Program, CBSL IP (GEFID 10208)

Context

The Congo Basin is globally important for climate regulation, rainfall patterns, carbon storage, biodiversity conservation, and multiple provisioning services for human communities and forest dependent people.

Congo Basin forests host around 80 million people, including 30 million of forest dependent communities, belonging to 150 ethnical groups. Population is expected to double by 2050.

The Congo Basin is still in relatively good health, with intact forests, low deforestation and forest degradation rates, mainly driven by smallscale agriculture. However, all the countries are counting on their natural resources to reach a new step of development. Upcoming threats are therefore mining, industrial agriculture (palm oil, coffee, cocoa, rubber), oil exploration and exploitation, commercial logging, charcoal fuel wood, and bush meat hunting, along with all the associated transportation and energy infrastructures

charcoal, fuel wood, and bush meat hunting, along with all the associated transportation and energy infrastructures.

The Congo Basin has also historically often been a place of violence, conflict, and instability, making it difficult to foster the conditions to support the rule of law, good governance, and sound investments.

Programme

The objective of the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (including one regional project and six country projects) is to catalyze transformational change in conservation and sustainable management of the Congo Basin through landscape approaches that empower local communities and forest dependent people, and through partnership with the private sector. The program will realize this objective through four components: 1) Enabling integrated framework for countries in targeted transboundary landscapes to plan, monitor and adapt land management and leverage local, national and international investments for SLM/SFM; 2) Longterm viability of forests and area-based management of critical high conservation value forest providing important habitat to endangered species and critical ecosystem services; 3) Sustainable use of forests by local communities and forest dependent people through strengthening of rights and tenure, and sustainable management of production sector activities; and 4) Capacity building, knowledge management, and regional cooperation.

The CBSL IP will mobilize \$57,201,127 from GEF resources, and \$387,383,108 from co-financing. The CBSL IP will include a regional project developed by UNEP, and six country projects: Central Africa Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Gabon with the World Bank, Equatorial Guinea with IUCN, and Cameroon, with WWF-US.

Global Environment Benefits

The CBSL IP will improve the management effectiveness of 20 protected areas covering more than 6.4 million ha, create 600,000ha of new Protected Areas, restore 500,000 ha of forest and forest lands, improve land management practices on more than 4.3 million ha of landscapes. All these activities will result in GHG emissions reductions of 121 million tCO₂ and target 358,000 direct beneficiaries, 53% being female.

GEF Strategies

The CBSL is aligned with the GEF7 programming strategies and the SFM Impact Programme.

Partnerships

UNEP is the leading Agency for the CBSL IP will serve as the hub of the program. UNEP is the GEF Agency for the regional project and for Republic of Congo. Other GEF Agencies are IUCN for Equatorial Guinea, the World Bank for Democratic Republic of Congo, Central Africa Republic, and Gabon, and WWF for Cameroon. Other GEF Agencies, as UNDP and AfDB will be associated. As far as possible, existing partners and platforms will be reinforced to avoid duplication. The use of internet technology will be the preferred option to reduce transaction costs. Partnerships will be confirmed at PPG, but several partners and institutions have already been approached, as the Congo Basin Institute, Central Africa Forest Initiative, CAFI, the Economic Community of Central African States, ECCAS, the Central African Forest Commission, COMIFAC, and the Conference on Central African moist Forest Ecosystems, or CEFDHAC. The private sector will also be involved (investment funds, commodities, SME). Indigenous People issues will be central to the CBSL IP, and addressed with the REPALEAC, the Network of Indigenous and Local Communities for the Sustainable management of Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa. UNEP also

currently hosts several platforms and initiatives related to biodiversity conservation, transboundary initiatives, and the global peatland initiative.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/19/2019	4/26/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/7/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

