



Addressing Outstanding Barriers and Leveraging Durable Financial Mechanisms to Achieve Target 3 in Gabon

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11512

Countries

Gabon

Project Name

Addressing Outstanding Barriers and Leveraging Durable Financial Mechanisms to Achieve Target 3 in Gabon

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

4/1/2024

Review completed by PM

4/5/2024

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

GBFF

PIF

CEO

1. General Project Information

a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners? b) Are the project tags properly selected, i.e. any tag on 'support to IPLCs' or KMGBF target is justified given the project description.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/4/2024 - Cleared.

JS 5/17/2024 - Thank you for the resubmission of this project and the thorough revisions and responses throughout this review sheet.

1- The portal entry still contains 28 occurrences of "IP&LC". Please correct and ensure that the portal entry is fully consistent with the word version of the project document. Some updates done in the word document, including on "IPLC", are not reflected in the portal entry.

The rest is cleared.

JS 4/2/2024 - Thank you for the submission of this GBFF project.

a) Cleared.

b) Please add the tag 'support to IPLCs', since the project will directly support IPLCs, including with \$700,000 of GBFF project financing to support actions by IPLCs.

1) The project document alternates between "IPLC" and "IP&LC". Given IPLC is the term used by the CBD, the KMGBF and thus by the GBFF, please use "IPLC" throughout or justify deviations from the term IPLC, and explain what it means in the context of this project.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 6.4.2024

This oversight has been addressed.

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

a) -

b) The IPLC tag is now checked in the portal.

1) All instances of "IP&LC" have been replaced with "IPLC" throughout the document, as suggested.

c) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected with corresponding CCM, CCA, BD and LD benefits made explicit in the project objective, log-frame and/or theory of change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/17/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/2/2024

1- Given the project's objective, Please rate the project as Principal Objective (2) on the Biodiversity Rio Marker

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

The project has now been rated as "Principal Objective (2)" for the Biodiversity Rio Marker.

2. Project Summary

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/11/2024 - Cleared.

JS 6/5/2024 - Given the change in project core indicator (removal of the marine portion of the Mayumba National Park and not target /under core indicator 2), please revise the following sentence in the summary to remove the reference to marine protected areas:

The co-design and delivery of HWC management with IPLC is expected to improve IPLC input to management decisions and increase communication and trust between IPLC and PA managers, compared to the current baseline, increasing management effectiveness (measured by METT) of terrestrial and marine PAs (1,023,700 and 96,500 ha respectively). IPLC-led HWC management will improve management in at least 14,000 ha of areas outside of PAs that are key for connectivity with the PA system. TNC will execute both projects.

JS 5/17/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/2/2024:

Please expand in the summary on what "integrating HWC into the Gabon PFP" means in practical terms.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 6.11.2024

This oversight has been adjusted in a) CER; b) Results Framework. The correct new total for number of ha of terrestrial protected areas under improved management is 1,030,200.

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

The following language has been added to the Project Summary section, to specify what "integrating HWC into the Gabon PFP" means in practical terms.

"Integration of HWC management into the PFP means ensuring that the PFP's conservation and finance plans, as well as its implementing mechanisms (the CTF), incorporate HWC management as a priority conservation strategy, in order to ensure funding flows to this important issue which is central to the achievement of Target 3. To further enhance the integration process, the main advisory body for the PFP, or a subcommittee thereof, will also be the steering committee for the HWC project."

The description of the PSC in the Institutional Arrangements Section has also been updated to emphasize the connection between governance of the HWC project and the PFP. The

language describing the PSC now reads:

"The PFP Advisory body, or a HWC-focused subcommittee of this body, will serve as the Project Steering Committee for this project. Terms of Reference for the PSC, prescribing membership and participation, inter alia, will be finalized during project start-up. Members will include: representatives of TNC at the global and country levels; the Government of Gabon; and Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities. The participation of a women's organization will be sought. The PSC will oversee technical and financial execution of the project: reviewing and approving annual workplans and budgets, project reports, and any adaptive management measures required during project execution, and generally provide strategic direction over the course of project execution. The GEF Agency for the project will participate as a non-voting observer."

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- d) For multi-Trust Fund projects with GEFTF financing, are the GEFTFT Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for projects with GEF project financing less than or equal to \$2 million) or 5% (for projects above \$2 million)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/17/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/2/2024

b1. output 1.1.3 should focus on good practice in targeted behavior change and strategic communication approaches versus public awareness writ large. Please revise the output and refer to the ongoing work under the Global Wildlife Program global coordination platform lead by the World Bank which has a focus on behavior and social-science-based approaches to human-wildlife conflict/coexistence.

c- Gender dimensions are not included explicitly in the components. Please correct.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

b1. Output 1.1.3 has been eliminated. The language describing 1.1.3 has been struck from the logframe (Project Description Overview). The budget from that output has been added to

Output 1.1.1 to add dissemination and communications strategy for the HWC National Strategy.

c. The Project Description Overview table and the project strategy section of the CER have been reviewed and updated with gender dimensions in mind, following a thorough revision of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan. Specifically, adjustments have been made to the following outcome/output statements in Table B: Outcome 1.1, Output 1.1.1, Outcome 2.1, Output 2.1.1, and Output 2.1.2. Accompanying adjustments have been made in the project strategy section. In addition, the following sections of the project strategy description have been updated to incorporate gender into project design: 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, and 4.1.1.

Project Outline

4. CHANGES COMPARED to PPG REQUEST

4.1 Are changes to the project design, including to elements put forward in the PPG request to meet GBFF selection criteria, been described and justified. And are they acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared, thank you for the clarification. Please see the comment box on core indicators for a follow-up request based on this response.

JS 4/4/2024

1- Please clarify why a project focused on terrestrial HWC is to intervene on a marine protected area, and how interventions on terrestrial HWC would have an impact on MPA management effectiveness.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

The Mayumba National Park is formally designated as an MPA, but it includes 6,500 ha of terrestrial area along a thin tongue of beach, dunes, savanna, and rain-forest that supports a wide array of wildlife including elephants, gorillas, chimpanzees, hippopotamus, and others. HWC with elephants has been reported by nearby communities, and ANPN has tested/developed HWC strategies in the area. This project will address HWC issues in terrestrial areas around the park and contribute to increased METT scores in what is technically an MPA. Text explaining this has been added to the section entitled "Changes Compared to PPG Request" and the Mayumba National Park description.

5 B. Project Rationale

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is a blended finance project under GBFF Action Area 4, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/3/2024

1. In line with the approved PPG request, please frame the project rationale, in particular the second paragraph, around the barriers to achieve Target 3. While it becomes clear later on, the current start of the project rationale focuses on HWC per se, when the project is funded by the GBFF because it addresses one outstanding barrier that threatens the PfP progress and the achievement of Target 3.

2. Please correct the typo or clarify the following formulation:

and other species can drastically reduce income and food security of rural communities, producing negative perceptions towards wildlife and perpetuating poverty. **While the lack of focus on or development of HWC is a barrier to effective PA management,** there are barriers to the adoption and implementation of HWC management at numerous levels:

3. What are presented as "future narratives" are a description of the project increment (scenario with/without the project or part of the project) and not simple narratives to inform robust design and ensure results durability. The latter type of narratives describe plausible futures for a set of key system drivers that are outside of the project's control but may impact the durability of its outcomes. They are meant to test if the project design is robust to uncertainty in these external drivers, such as climate change, given its well established impact on HWC. Please rename the section "future narratives" in the CEO endorsement request, and please develop simple future narratives following STAP guidance (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/simple-future-narratives-brief-and-primer>).

4. Please add the Gabon child project and, given this GBFF project will target the Mont de Cristal National Park, the regional child project under the GEF-7 Congo Forest Impact Program in the baseline:

GEF ID 10729, *Transforming Forest Landscape Governance in the Lower Ogoou? - Lower Nyanga Landscape Corridor*, UNDP: While focusing on other landscapes, this child project is to develop a HWC mitigation program.

GEF ID 10269, *Transformational Change in Sustainable Forest Management in Transboundary Landscapes of the Congo Basin*, which will notably develop integrated land use planning in a transboundary landscape including the Mont de Cristal National Park. and is set to also improve protected area management of the Mont de Cristal National Park.

5. The project document states that a list of stakeholders is available in annex E, which is not the case, please delete:

A list of other potential project stakeholders (Government, NGO, Academic, and Private Sector) by PA can be found in the table in ANNEX E: Project Map and Coordinates, while further information can be found in ANNEX J: Stakeholder Engagement Plan.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

1. The description of the environmental problem in the project rationale section has been reformulated to align it with the language of the PPG funding request and emphasize the relationship between the project's HWC interventions and the achievement of Target 3.
2. The revision of the project rationale has eliminated the referenced language / cleared the typo.
3. The future narratives section has been completely redrafted following a review of the STAP primer in order to assess the robustness of the project's proposed measures. Adjustments to the text appear in red.
4. The referenced projects have been added into Table 1. Additions appear in red text.
5. The reference to Annex E in the "Project Stakeholders" section of the CER has been removed. It now reads: "A full statement of project stakeholders appears in ANNEX J: Stakeholder Engagement Plan."

6 B. Project Description

- 6.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (a narrative and a diagram) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on previous and ongoing investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**
- c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described, proposed solutions, critical assumptions, and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other options?**
- d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits identified?**
- e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options)?**
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, IPLCs, private sector, CSOs) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and descriptions?**
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communications adequately described?**

- k) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations, or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes? How will that be addressed?
- l) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?
- m) **For blended finance project only, is the financial structure adequately explained?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/5/2024 - Cleared.

JS 5/14/2014 -

a1. Thank you but the ToC diagram remains unreadable in the portal entry. Please revise. Please notably consider pasting it as a full page in landscape orientation, in addition to enlarging the size of all text boxes.

a2. Thank you for providing assumptions. However, to be useful, assumptions must be linked to specific causal pathways of the ToC, and reciprocally, all causal links used the ToC should identify underlying assumptions/preconditions for the link to work. Some of the assumptions provided are not assumptions underlying the ToC but rather a description of the causal pathway itself (e.g. Piloted HWC and co-existence measures and related incentives promote human wildlife coexistence and reduced HWC). Please revise the assumptions and ensure ToC diagram shows which assumption(s) relate(s) to which causal pathway. Please see STAP guidance : <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

a3: Thank you for the revisions but the ToC narrative is still not adequate. It is not straightforward to reconcile with the diagram and the project description provided as a separate text under the ToC diagram, when they should be merged. Also, the causal pathway "If there is improved PA management, then 30x30 Target 3 achievement is enabled" does not seem in line with the scope of the project and what is required to achieve T3 in Gabon.

The narrative should stay short but contain, as a minimum, a rationale for the intervention, a situation or context analysis, and a description of the intervention's causal pathways, explaining barriers, enablers, assumptions and conveying why it is considered that the chosen intervention pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please see STAP guidance : <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer> and examples provided in: <https://www.thegef.org/events/gef-8-pif-template-and-project-design-training-session>.

All the rest is cleared.

JS 4/3/2024

a1. The ToC diagram is not readable, please increase the font size and size of the diagram as needed.

a2. Please identify key assumptions underlying the ToC.

a3. The ToC narrative is overly complicated compared to the project design. Please streamline the ToC narrative and ensure it better conveys that the intended outcome is to enable achievement of Target 3.

b. The annex on lessons learned from the GEF-6 GWP project noted. However, please describe, and include in the CER endorsement documents, how this GBFF project will specifically build on the activities and lessons from the GEF-6 project on HWC (on policy coherence/work across ministries, technical approaches, sustainability of impact, finance, and gender).

c1- Since HWC is framed as a threat to biodiversity conservation in Gabon and in the TOC for the project, please further describe how the issue of HWC will be effectively integrated into the PFP strategy, plans and financing, as opposed to being treated like a 'parallel' issue or approach. This should also include sustainable financing for HWC measures.

c2. Component 2 aims at behavior change but is not clear on the anticipated strategies that will be employed. While we understand that the behavior change strategies are to be developed during implementation, please refer to STAP's guidance on behavior change (<https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/why-behavioral-change-matters-gef-and-what-do-about-it>), and please expand on the project anticipated approach, notably clarifying that the project will consider combining multiple behavior change strategies and will embed a robust monitoring and evaluation framework for assessing behavioral change.

c3 - Component 2: The projects plans to provide subgrants. Please clarify the anticipated sub-granting process, arrangements and criteria that will be used to ensure intended impact, fairness and appropriate fiduciary standards.

c4- Component 3: Please engage directly with the Global Wildlife Programme's global platform on lessons learnt.

i1- We note the Annex I (Gender Analysis and Action Plan) and that the project replied yes to all gender tags, but the results of the analysis and the gender activities have not been integrated in the log-frame or project description. Please include gender dimensions in the project description and log-frame as appropriate. Please also see comments on the gender tags and on the GAAP in the dedicated comment boxes.

i2 - In Outcomes 1.1., 1.2, and 2.1, please ensure that women are actively engaged as stakeholders in the development of plans and in related stakeholder dialogues and consultations, and that any public awareness plans, pilots and their dissemination reach women.

i3 - In Output 3.1.1 please ensure to capture and disseminate good practice and lessons learned from a gender perspective.

i4- Under M&E, please ensure that gender results, including the Gender Action plan are monitored and reported on.

e- Anticipated socio-economic benefits have not been described. Please elaborate.

g- This has not been addressed. See comment on future narratives in the previous comment box and explain how the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the main drivers that are outside of the control of the project but may impact the durability of its outcomes.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 6.4.2024

a1. We have revised the diagram to associate assumptions with causal pathways, and included a .pdf version of the TOC illustration as Annex R. It should be readable in this format. We have uploaded a revised TOC diagram in the CER as well. Efforts to upload such a large complex image in color caused the GEF Portal to time-out. To address this we changed the image to grayscale. It appears to be more readable in this format.

a2. The TOC and TOC diagram appearing in Section 6 "Project Description" have been revised to address this comment.

a3. The TOC has been redrafted to align more closely with the TOC diagram and to respond to the guidance provided in this comment.

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

a1. The ToC has been revised to improve readability: all of the boxes have been retyped in ALL CAPS to increase the font size. The revised ToC has also been uploaded as an Annex (Annex R ? ?Updated ToC Diagram?).

a2. Assumptions have been added to the TOC narrative.

a3. The ToC narrative has been streamlined in response to this comment and now better highlights the relationship between this project and Target 3.

b. Text has been added in the section entitled "Baseline of HWC Management in Gabon" that describes how this GBFF project will specifically build on the activities and lessons from the GEF-6 project on HWC. The lessons/insights from this project have also informed the overall project design.

c1. Integration of the HWC theme into the PFP means ensuring that the PFP?s conservation and finance plans, as well as its implementing mechanisms (the CTF), incorporate HWC as a priority conservation strategy, in order to ensure funding flows over the medium- long-terms from the PFP financing mechanisms to this important issue which is central to the achievement of Target 3. This means that the PFP development process (including extensive

consultations with government agencies, communities) will integrate a focus on HWC management, financing projections, and fundraising objectives into its architecture so that CTF funds can support communities facing HWC challenges. To further enhance the integration process, the advisory body for the PFP will also be the steering committee for the HWC project. The description of Output 1.2.1 in the Project Components section has been updated to include this detail.

c2. Text has been added under the description of Output 2.1.1 to elaborate on the project's approach to behavior change, including the use of multiple, complementary interventions to achieve desired outcomes and the need for robust monitoring and evaluation framework for addressing behavioral change.

c3. A footnote on subgranting (to be led by TNC in accordance with its due diligence process) appears in the description of Component 2. A fuller description of the approach to subgranting appears in the Institutional Arrangements section.

c4: Text has been added in Component 3 to specify that the project will feed lessons/experience notes through the Global Wildlife Program's global platform on lessons learnt, which will recognize this HWC project as a "cousin" project. Furthermore, a reference to the "cousin project" appears in the section entitled "Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects."

i1: The Project Description Overview table and the project strategy section of the CER have been reviewed and updated with gender dimensions in mind, following a thorough revision of the Gender Analysis and Action Plan. These adjustments to the text have been made. Specifically, adjustments have been made to the following outcome/output statements in Table B: Outcome 1.1, Output 1.1.1, Outcome 2.1, Output 2.1.1, and Output 2.1.2.

Accompanying adjustments have been made in the project strategy section. In addition, the following sections of the project strategy description have been updated to incorporate gender into project design: 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, and 4.1.1.

i2: The adjustments to the text noted immediately above address this comment.

i3: Component 3 has been updated to specify that the lessons learnt document that will be developed in Year 4 will capture and help to disseminate good practice and lessons from a gender perspective and that the role of women in the national HWC strategy and PA management at all levels (government and community) will be widely acknowledged in all project documents (reports, M&E, studies/surveys).

i4: The project results framework includes an indicator to help ensure that the Gender Action Plan is monitored and the PMU is accountable for its contents. A note has been added to Component 4: M&E, to make clear that annual workplans and budget will reflect gender-related activities as per the GAP. Adjustments to the text have been made.

e) The description of Component 2 has been updated to incorporate an indicative list of anticipated socioeconomic benefits of the project. Adjustments to the text have been made.

f) There was no comment "f" in the GEF Sec review.

g) The future narratives analysis has resulted in insights to inform a project design/ ensure resilience to future changes. The following insights have informed project design and have been integrated in relevant parts of the project strategy (Output 2.1.1 and 1.2.1,

respectively): 1) that when developing HWC measures consideration should be given to possible challenges with respect to maintenance / sustainability of interventions contemplated under Component 2 in light of likely population scenarios / demographics; and 2) the instruments governing the use of PFP resources (which will include HWC as a core theme) should allow for the periodic reassessment to account for changes occasioned by the above-noted drivers. For this reason, the description of the work to be undertaken under 1.2.1 reads: "The PFP governance instruments (e.g. operations manual) will ensure provision is made for adjustments to the HWC strategy over time, to respond to new threats, pressures, and priorities." For the HWC measures to be undertaken under 2.1.1, a note has been added at the end of the Output description that reads "Likewise, when developing HWC measures consideration should be given to possible challenges with respect to maintenance / sustainability of interventions contemplated under Component 2 in light of likely population scenarios / demographics and other drivers of change."

6.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives (e.g., government, other bilateral/multilateral).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/3/2024-

c- Current elaboration only refers to the GEF-7 Enduring Earth project and unspecified "NGOs, community organizations, and private sector entities working in the four project PA sites". Please see comment on the baseline, and please be more precise on planned coordination.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

c. A description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives (e.g., government, other bilateral/multilateral) has been added in the Institutional Arrangements Section, under the illustration.

6.3 GEF Core indicators and GBFF indicators

- a) Are the identified GBFF and relevant GEF core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through GBFF indicators, relevant GEF core indicators, and additional listed outcome indicators) reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/11/2024 - Cleared.

JS 6/4/2024

2- As commented on earlier and in line with the Agency response below, please correct the surface area reported for under core indicator 1 for the Mayumba National Park to reflect only the terrestrial area, i.e. 6,500 ha:

Mayumba (Marine) National Park	301850	National Park	96,500.00
---	--------	------------------	-----------

A- Thank you but no new METT templates / tracking tools have been uploaded with this submission so that the METT template is still incomplete, in particular the name of reviewers and completion date. Please complete for all PAs:

I. General Data	Please indicate your answer here	Notes
Please complete this section for all projects under Objective 1.		
Project Title		
GEF Project ID		
Agency Project ID		
Implementing Agency		
Project Type		FSP or MSP
Country	GABON	
Region	AFR	
Date of submission of the tracking tool	March 26, 2024	Month DD, YYYY (e.g. May 12, 2010)
Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion date		Completion Date
Planned project duration		years
Actual project duration		years under implementation to date
Lead Project Executing Agency (ies)		

JS 5/24/2024

2- Thank you for the detailed response. However, given the project activities will benefit only the relatively small terrestrial part of the protected area, claiming an impact over the larger marine part of the protected area is not adequate. Please:

- remove the target under core indicator 2

- report the terrestrial part of the protected area (6,500 ha) under core indicator 1.2.

Please nonetheless use, as usual, the METT score for the entire management unit, the entire PA.

A- Please fill in the tracking tool (METT spreadsheet) in its entirety for each PA, in particular the name of reviewers and completion date :

all projects under Objective 1.

Project Title		
GEF Project ID		
Agency Project ID		
Implementing Agency		
Project Type		F
Country	GABON	
Region	AFR	
Date of submission of the tracking tool	March 26, 2024	M
Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion date		C
Planned project duration		y
Actual project duration		y
Lead Project Executing Agency (ies)		

The rest is cleared.

JS 4/3/2024

1- The project reports close to 1.1 million hectares under core indicator 1.2 and 2.2. However, the project will support very targeted activities related to HWC, which seem insufficient to significantly increase management effectiveness, as measured by the METT. Please explain how the project is to provide a measurable increment to PA management effectiveness over that of the increment that will be provided by the baseline GEF-7 PfP project. Please note that the Results framework should include a target METT score for each PA at the end-of-project, given the METT is already supposed to increase thanks to the baseline projects, please ensure that the target clarifies the contribution specific to this project.

2- The project reports 96,500.00 under core indicator 2.2. However, as we understand it, the project will support only activities related to terrestrial HWC. Please explain how it would provide a measurable increment to MPA management effectiveness?

3- Please include the baseline METT scores in the portal for all PAs reported under core indicator 1.2 and 2.2.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 6.11.2024

This oversight has been adjusted.

The correct version of the file has been uploaded

WWF GEF Agency 6.4.2024

2. Adjustments have been made in the following sections of the document to address this comment and add to Core Indicator 1.2 the terrestrial part of the Mayumba National Park (6,500 ha) that will benefit from the project (note that core indicator 2 has been removed):

- "Changes Compared to PPG Request" adjusted to remove reference to inclusion of Core Indicator 2 (adjustments appear in light blue)
- "Alignment with Programming strategies and country/regional priorities," section "a. Potential of the project to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GBFF Results Indicators)"
- Table 4: "PROJECT CONTRIBUTION TO GEF CORE INDICATORS"
- The project results framework; and
- Annex K, Core Indicators Worksheet

A- The METT tracking tool (METT spreadsheet) has been updated and completed in its entirety.

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

1. The project is expected to yield increases in management effectiveness in the four target PAs (as documented by the METT tool). TNC (lead executing agency) has analyzed the METT scorecards for each of the four target PAs, and has indicated in this analysis the specific incremental benefit of this project to the increase of METT scores for each park. This analysis is contained in a new annex (Annex P, entitled "METT Analysis ? How This HWC Project?s Interventions Will Improve METT Scores"). The comment on the project results framework is acknowledged and the results framework has been adjusted to include baseline and target METT scores for each focal PA.

2. The 96,500 ha is the total area of Mayumba National Park which is a designated MPA per protectedplanet.net. The terrestrial area within the park -- a thin tongue of beach, dunes, savanna, and rain-forest -- includes populations of elephants, buffalo, gorillas, sitatunga (antelope), and crocodiles. As described more fully in Annex P, HWC measures in the terrestrial parts of the MPA will result in improved management effectiveness as reflected in increased METT scores.

3. A new annex (Annex P, entitled "METT Analysis ? How This HWC Project?s Interventions Will Improve METT Scores") accompanies the CEO Endorsement Request and has been uploaded to the portal that includes the baseline METT scores for the project's focal PAs (Loango, Mayumba, Minkebe, and Mont Cristal). The METT Scores have been added into the core indicators worksheet.

6.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/3/2024 - We note the attached Environmental and Social Management Framework, including a Process Framework and a Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework.

We note that it is reported that only "minimal consultations with communities" were carried out beyond the consultations undertaken for the GEF-7 PFP project. Please confirm that sufficient consultations have been carried out to ensure ESS standards, robust project design and buy-in from the communities present in the targeted areas.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

Thank you for your comment. ?Minimal consultations? was inaccurate wording and has been redacted. Sufficient consultations have been undertaken and will be continuous throughout the project start up and implementation.

Certainly, since this GBFF project will be co-implemented with the GEF 7 EE project, the materials for this submission were built on the extensive consultations that were conducted for the development of said GEF 7 project. Indeed, at the time of that project's development, a team of two consultants, together with staff from WWF Gabon and TNC Gabon, met directly with communities living near and inside the four national parks prioritized in the GBFF project, namely Mayumba, Loango, Minkebe and Monts de Cristal. Even though that fieldwork was conducted for the purpose of the PFP development, the IPLC communities engaged expressly stated their concerns around HWC and meaningful information on this issue was gathered at the time and incorporated into the safeguards documents.

We can confirm that sufficient consultations have been carried out for submission of this project. We note the following consultations / engagements beyond those undertaken for the design of the GEF-7 PFP project:

- 1) During the GBFF project preparation, an additional round of consultations was undertaken by a local consultant with ample expertise in stakeholder engagement and the community specialist at TNC Gabon. These focused on engaging conservators of the aforementioned national parks to obtain further detailed data on how HWC manifested in

those sites (including inputs on human population totals, impact of HWC, animal species involved in HWC, community perceptions, breakdown of ethnic groups around the parks, main income-generating activities, among others).

2) In November of 2023 and January of 2024, a series of field visits were done by TNC Gabon, led by their community specialist, in the provinces of Nyanga (periphery of Mayumba National Park), Ogoou? Maritime (periphery of Loango National Park), Ogoou? Ivindo (periphery of Minkebe National Park), Woleu Ntem (periphery of Minkebe National Park) and Estuaire (periphery of Monts de Cristal National Park). Although formally devised as a disclosure mission for the GEF 7 project, these meetings were attended by representatives of local communities and indigenous peoples who, in addition to validating the findings enclosed in the GEF 7 safeguards documents, offered new insight into their experiences with HWC, highlighting in particular the shortcomings of some of the present interventions (such as electric fencing and compensation). The translated report on this mission became available after the initial submission of the GBFF project, but the relevant consultations and data from these visits have now been incorporated into the safeguards documents (see section 4 of SEP) and informed the project design of the GBFF.

Lastly, we would like to highlight that, in order to ensure sustained and meaningful engagement of the communities present in the targeted areas during implementation, the project:

1) Will be co-designed and co-developed with the communities themselves (as described in the process for Component 2). In this context, the consultations conducted to date represent the starting point of an engagement that will be nurtured and sustained throughout this project's lifecycle.

Has incorporated the Community Engagement and Social Inclusion officer's role to facilitate those engagements and ensure that appropriate ESS standards are followed during implementation.

7 C. Alignment with Programming Strategies, Country/Regional Priorities

7.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with the GBFF Action Areas and, for MTF projects, with Focal Area objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/4/2024 -

1- Please strengthen the description of the alignment with Action Area 1, aligning with the rationale provide at PPG request stage, i.e. this project contributes to address what has been identified as the main outstanding barrier to achieve Target 3 in Gabon, given the baseline PfP process.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

The language in section D entitled "Alignment with Programming strategies and country/regional priorities" has been amended to improve the description of this HWC project's alignment to Action Area 1.

7.2 Is the project aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, National Biodiversity Finance Plans, and/or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities. For MTF projects, is the project aligned with other relevant country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and relevant sectors)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/4/24 - Cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/4/2024

1- Please identify more precisely how the project contributes to the identified targets, linking to specific project activities, outputs or outcomes. For targets 22 and 23, the current elaboration only states that project success will be based on active participation and engagement. Please be more precise on the project's contribution.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

For Target 22, more specificity has been added to the language in Section D "Alignment with Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities" in the appropriate section. It reads: "..., at a minimum, women and women's organizations, when possible, will actively participate in and provide input to the consultative workshops in the development of the national HWC strategy (Output 1.1.1); women and men will have equal opportunities/access to participate in the design, construction, application and monitoring/ management of measures in pilot sites (Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2). The participation of a suitable women's organization should be sought for the PSC."

For Target 23, "Ensure gender equality through a gender responsive approach," the text has been updated in Section D "Alignment with Programming strategies and country/regional priorities" in the appropriate section to read as follows:

Women's perspectives and concerns as relates to HWC will be reflected in the national HWC strategy (Output 1.1.1) and the PFP and CTF governing instruments (1.2.1) as well as in the HWC management measures undertaken under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.

Under Output 1.1.1, to ensure that the strategy development process incorporates gender dimensions, the following specific activities will be undertaken:

- Training to government, PFP, CTF staff on the importance of rural women's perspectives in the national HWC strategy;

- Socioeconomic studies and mapping - including gender dynamics, representation of both women and men, including allies and supporters of women and girl. The results of these will be fed into the national HWC strategy; and

- Active participation/input in the consultative workshops by IPLC women and other marginalized groups in the development of the national HWC strategy.

Under 1.1.2 The PMU will ensure equal opportunity for women and men to participate actively in National HWC commission launch workshops and events.

Under Output 1.2.1, gender mainstreaming and gender response modalities will be included in the conservation plans, CTF instruments as relates to HWC, e.g. Management plans, Operating manual(s), as appropriate.

With respect to the measures to be developed under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, women will actively participate in the decision-making on the selection and design of those measures; IPLC women will participate in HWC- focused visits to other communities in their area and around other PAs experiencing HWC to learn about and exchange management strategies. Special accommodations (women only meetings, timing of meetings, etc) may be required to ensure women's active participation.

For Output 2.1.1 The PMU will sensitize and improve knowledge and understanding of IPLC women's perspectives, strategies, and limitations to HWC management in the project site, and ensure that women and men have equal opportunities/access to participate in the design, construction, application and monitoring/ management of measures to developing and maintaining wildlife barriers, in pilot sites.

8 D. Policy Requirements

8.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/4/2024 -

1- The project responded yes to a contribution to "Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources". Please explain how and please include the explanation in the relevant part of the project description where the corresponding activities are described.

2- The project responded yes to a contribution to "**Generating socio-economic benefits or services for women**". Please explain how and please include the explanation in the relevant part of the project description where the corresponding activities are described.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

1 ? The following language has been added in the high-level description of Component 2 in response to this comment: ?Stakeholder consultations indicated the project will likely serve an equal (50/50) ratio of men and women in the project sites. Agriculture is a common sustenance and income-generating activity in all project sites, and the project's gender analysis confirmed that women are more likely than men to be involved in agriculture in the four project sites. Agricultural activities pose a greater risk of HWC through exposure and resource devastation than other common income generating activities, such as fishing, which is more likely to be conducted by men. The greater risk may hinder women's ability to access natural resources for farming and handicrafts, another common income-generating activity for women, e.g., those that require passage into or through forested areas or other areas of human wildlife interface. Low access to information about human wildlife conflict or effective management strategies, demonstrated in part through the gender gap in access to information and communication technology, may also limit women?s access to natural resources through inability or reduced ability to apply management measures. The project acknowledges the improving representation of women in local governance councils and access and discretion over use of income is gender-balanced. The measures implemented under this project (under 2.1.1 and 2.1.2) will both improve access to natural resources that are integral to livelihoods and well being of women through increasing access to information on and building capacity in HWC management, with emphasis on the agricultural sector.?

2 - Project-funded interventions -- and those enabled over the medium- to long-terms through the PFP -- are expected to yield socioeconomic benefits in affected communities, including increased food security and increased income, as well as improved physical and emotional security. These benefits will extend to both women and men living around the project's target PAs. As the populations of many rural communities around the project's four target PAs have relatively higher proportions of women, youth, and elders, women may benefit disproportionately, depending on the demographic makeup of the community in question. This clarification has been added to the Component 2 description in the ?Project Components? section.

8.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/4/2024 -

1- The document provided as Annex I still contains tracked changes. Please provide the final version of the Gender Action plan.

2- The gender analysis and its recommendations are entirely generic. Given the project specific target areas, please provide a gender analysis that fully reflects the project's context and can inform its specific activities.

3- All the activities of the gender action plan are rather passive (capturing perspectives and inputs from women in strategies, ensuring participation) with, for instance, no targets for a certain share of women-led on-the-ground HWC activities. Please consider including activities or targets that will more directly contribute to women empowerment.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

1. The tracked changes have been removed from the Gender Action Plan; the final version has been uploaded to the portal.
2. The GAAP has undergone a thorough revision to reflect the project's context / the particular characteristics of the communities living near the focal protected areas. The project logframe and strategy sections have been adjusted to incorporate gender dimensions in line with this revision. The revised GAAP has been uploaded to the portal.
3. The GAAP has undergone a thorough revision. It now includes activities more directly contributing to women's empowerment.

8.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/3/2024 - Yes, as Annex J. Cleared.

Agency Response

8.4 IPLCs:

- a) Has the amount of GBFF project financing to support actions by IPLCs been sufficiently justified and have changes compared to PPG request stage, if any, been adequately justified?**
- b) If applicable, does Section C 'Project Description' describe the IPLCs who will benefit from the project and detail their role in the project? Have appropriate project tags related to IPLCs been selected?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestJS 4/3/2024 - Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

9.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestJS 4/3/2024 - Cleared.

Agency Response

9.2 Source of Funds

If using GEFTF resources, does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestJS 4/3/2024 - Cleared.

Agency Response

9.3 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type:

Noting GBFF does not require but encourages co-financing, are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestJS 4/3/2024 - Cleared. We note that no co-financing has been identified.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

9.4 a) Have the GBFF indicators and relevant GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; are the targets appropriate for the total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/4/2024 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 5/24/2024

a-Thank you for the revisions and the annex clarifying how the project is to increase the METT score. However the target METT scores at year 4 in the results framework, as we understand it, only include the increment that is to be provided by this project when these protected areas will also benefit from the GEF-7 PfP project. Please either change the target as "Increment in METT score attributed to this project" instead of the absolute METT score, or change the value of the targeted METT score at year 4 to also include the baseline increase anticipated from the GEF-7 PfP project.

b1: Thank you. We note several baselines are still missing. Please clarify the plans and the timeline for their establishment, ensuring they are established within the first 6 months of implementation, first year at the latest.

The rest is cleared.

JS 4/3/2024

a. For core indicators 2.2 and 1.2, the baseline and end of project targets in the Results framework should be the METT score, not the number of hectares. It means the project should include a target for METT improvement thanks to the project and baseline projects.

b1. We note that baselines and targets are missing for several indicators. A full results framework is required at CEO endorsement stage. Please revise.

b2. Given the project is focused on HWC management, when METT captures all dimension of PA management, please include (in addition to the METT) an indicator dedicated to capturing the specific contribution of the project to PA management.

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 6.4.2024

a. The results framework has been updated so that the targets for Core Indicator 1.2 appear as the incremental increase in METT scores for each PA attributed to this project.

b1. A brief narrative of the plan for establishing baselines and select annual targets has been added following the results framework table, as well as a short note in the comments column for the relevant indicators.

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

a. The Results Framework has been updated so that the baseline and end of project targets for core indicators 2.2 and 1.2 are expressed as METT scores, rather than number of hectares. See also: Annex P, which describes the incremental contribution of this GBFF project to improved management effectiveness of target protected areas, and (new) Annex Q containing the METT scorecards for the target PAs.

b. The Results Framework has been updated so that, where possible, baselines and targets are included for the listed indicators.

b2. A new indicator has been added to the Results Framework to help to assess the specific contribution of this GBFF project (i.e. the specific contribution of HWC-focused measures) to the improvement of PA management effectiveness in the project's focal PAs. The new indicator relates to Outcome 1.2. It reads as follows: "PA management plans have improved articulation of HWC and coexistence objectives, activities, information gathering, and monitoring reflected that is aligned with the national HWC strategy." Baseline is "0" and target for the end of the project is "4". While the revision of management plans is financed by the GEF7 Enduring Earth project, the substance of those revisions as relates to HWC will originate in the work of this project (under Components 1 and 2, through the process to develop the national strategy, and the strategy itself, as well as the consultations attending the development of IPLC-led HWC measures).

Also, text has been added to Indicator 3 for Outcome 2.1 in the Project Results Framework, which will measure "Number of survey respondents reporting a positive shift in community attitudes, knowledge and perceptions/practices towards wildlife and habitat conservation and/or willingness to coexist with wildlife." In order to measure changes in the attitudes and perceptions of IPLCs and community members, notes have been added in the "Disaggregation" and "Notes" columns of the RF to ensure that this information will be Disaggregated by PA, as well as by stakeholder (IPLC, PA staff, others) and that in the completion of surveys there will be sufficient representation IPLC in targeted communities of the four PAs. Positive changes in these areas will have a positive impact on PA management.

Annex D: Status of utilization of PPG

9.5 Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 5/24/2024 - Cleared.

JS 4/3/2024 - Only the aggregate amount spent is reported. Please provide the breakdown by categories as per guidelines.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

Annex D on PPG Utilization has been updated to include expenditure categories. Adjustments to the text have been made.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

9.6 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/3/2024 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

9.7 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 4/3/2024 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

9.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/5/2024 - Cleared.

JS 5/24/2024

1- Please provide the budget as a static document/spreadsheet, and not as a dynamic google document.

The rest is cleared.

JS 4/4/2024

1. The budget G is not consistent with that of table B, for instance PMC is \$136,449 in the annex vs 124,045 in table B. None of the components' budget match. Please revise to ensure consistency.

2. The "Human Wildlife Coexistence & Project Management Specialist" is to be responsible for day-to-day project management but is charged only for 5% on PMC, when

it should be mainly funded through PMC. Please correct. We note the Terms of reference provided that justify the cross-charge to components.

3. The budget includes a mid-term evaluation when it is not planned according to the project documentation. Please revise to ensure consistency.

4. Please clarify what is the generic "management fees" charged for \$27,631 on the PMC. Generic fees for EA are not eligible for GEF funding.

Agency Response

WWF GEF Agency 6.4.2024

A static version of the budget has been included as Annex G.

WWF GEF Agency 5.14.2024

1. The budget figures in Table B have been updated to be consistent with the budget in Annex G. The correct PMC figure is \$124,045.

2. The budget has been adjusted so that 10% of the HWC specialist role is now attributed to PMC. The majority of the HWC Specialist's time will be dedicated to management of project components 1 and 2. PMU oversight/leadership will come from the Gabon PFP Director and PFP Coordinator. Budget notes have been adjusted to explain this. Likewise, the institutional arrangements section of the CER has been adjusted to reflect these changes.

3. The reference to the mid-term evaluation has been removed from the budget. Funds have been retained in this line item to cover the costs of a robust Terminal Evaluation.

4. Further explanation of the management fees has been provided to show they are not generic. They were considerably reduced after adjusting in response to comments 1 and 2.

Annex H: Blended Finance Relevant Annexes

9.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

10. GEFSEC DECISION

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/11/2024 - This project is recommended for technical clearance.

JS 6/5/2024 - Not at this stage. Please address the two remaining comments (summary, core indicator targets) and resubmit.

JS 5/26/2024 - Not at this stage. Please address comments included in this review sheet and resubmit.

JS 4/9/2024 - Not at this stage. Please address comments included in this review sheet and resubmit.

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/9/2024	5/15/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2024	6/4/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/5/2024	6/11/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review (as
necessary)**