

Integrated management of natural resources in the Bafing Faleme landscape

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9783

Countries

Guinea

Project Name

Integrated management of natural resources in the Bafing Faleme landscape

Agenices

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/23/2019

Review completed by PM

11/21/2019

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- We take note of the change in the project name. The change is justified, and is an outcome of the inception workshop. The revised project should be then "Integrated management of natural resources in the Bafing Faleme landscape".
- The other changes are marginal, and a logical result of the PPG: adjustment of the indicators, baseline numbers, targets, adjustment of formulation of outputs.
- The cofinancing has been increased and confirmed.

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- During the review at PIF level, we insisted to use this project also to reinforce the capacities of CSO and stakeholders on the ground. The role of national and local NGOs was essential to collect data, initiate actions, and finally get the attention of the international community on the importance of this area. We are not seeing this opportunity anymore, or at a very low level under the output 1.1.1. Please, correct.
- The governance aspects cannot only be assigned to the MEEF and OGUIPAR. There are enough evidences in the GEF/UNDP portfolio about the importance to associate and empower national and local CSO/NGO for conservation (see Niger, Guinea Bissau, Senegal, etc). It is particularly true in the countries who went through fragility, violence, and/or conflict, and where central ministries and agencies can be weakened by internal events. We do want to see an active role for national and local CSO/NGOs in terms of conservation, monitoring, or livelihoods activities, and not only as participants in regional committees. Please, confirm.

July 1st, 2019

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

ST_21/06/2019

We agree that local NGOs have played a key role. We reformulated several outputs and activities to better highlight their role in the project implementation:

- Component 1: we added the capacity development plan designed for the local NGO identified during the PPG (output 1.1). Besides, biodiversity inventories will be carried out by CERESCOR and local NGOs. See pages 40-42 of the ProDoc.
- Component 2: the Gambia-Falémé reserve will be created and implemented with the support of Guinée Ecologie. The Mali Reserve will be created by JGI (local NGO under registration) and its CSO partners.
- Component 3: local NGOs (among those identified during the PPG: AVODEPPE, ADJEDELOPE, ADECOM, VAPE and SYNADDEV) will train EV management committees (output 3.1), will carry out agro-ecology activities (output 3.4) and educational/awareness activities (output 3.6).

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

In terms of cost-effectiveness and sustainability, we are surprised to not see the National Coordination of Farmer Organizations involved in project implementation, CNOP-G is mentioned in the stakeholder consultation plan, but not in the result framework, and the operators. Coordination of Farmer Organizations are important partners for the LD agenda and the promotion of conservation agriculture, agroecology, and climate smart agriculture. We would recommend to associate them in the project implementation and assign them a clear role, for instance under the output 3.4.

July 1st, 2019

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

ST_21/06/2019

The CNOP-G has been added as a key partner for implementation of output 3.4. It will first benefit from trainings in agro-ecology (soil fertility restoration, agroforestry, stone lines, etc.) and methodological aspects provided by an international NGO. And then it will support the dissemination of SLM best practices in the villages. See page 55 of the ProDoc.

Besides, the CNOP-G is also involved in the output 3.5 through its member the “Federation des Apiculteurs du Fouta Djallon”.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- The first risk mentioned is the political instability faced by the country in the recent years. We agree with this risk, but as a mitigation measure, we would like to clearly see mentioned the role of Non-Governmental Organizations, CSO, farmer organizations, etc, and name them. The only mention of a "coalition of partners and stakeholders" is too vague. In this kind of context, it is fundamental to diversify the operators, and find complementary solutions to the central and national authorities.
- Climate change is mentioned as an environmental risk. However, we are surprised to not see mention of the dam development, and especially the Koukoutamba dam that could threaten 1,500 chimpanzees (<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/feb/28/chinese-dam-project-in-guinea-could-kill-up-to-1500-chimpanzees>). It seems that dam development represents the most immediate environmental risk. Please, correct.

- It is written that communities do not eat chimpanzees in this part of Guinea, (p7 of the request for CEO endorsement). It is true. However, communities in South-West Guinea (Forested Guinea) eat chimps, and there are suspicions of bush-meat trafficking between the Fouta Djallon and the Forested Guinea. It is a risk to include, and where national and local NGOs may have a role (see item 2 above).

July 1st, 2019

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

ST_21/06/2019

- The mitigation measures for political instability have been specified: the project will also work with NGOs (WCF, JGI, Guinée44 and Gret), with CSOs (AVODEPPE, ADJEDELOPE, ADECOM, VAPE and SYNADEV) and farmers organizations (CNOP-G, Fédération des Apiculteurs du Fouta Djallon) whose interest in rural development will likely sustain, even in case of regime change.

- The dam development has been added to the risk.

- The risk of bush-meat trafficking has been added. CSOs will facilitate increased involvement of local communities in wildlife enforcement and monitoring activities, and address the need for enhanced sustainable livelihood opportunities to reduce dependency on vulnerable habitats and wildlife within the Bafing-Falémé landscape.

See pages 62-63 of the ProDoc.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- The cofinancing from ECREEE should be detailed in the portal with three lines of information: \$2,000,000 in-kind, \$200,000 in grants, and \$200,000 in loans. Please, correct.

July 1st, 2019

XXX

Response to Secretariat comments

ST_21/06/2019

Done. See page 4 of the CEO Endorsement.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

EXACT Tools:

- A National Deforestation Rate is used: Don't you think there is any better estimate in the targeted area? If not, what enable you to assume that this area suffers more or less the same deforestation rate than the national one?
- The avoided deforestation is only calculated over a 6 years period while the accountability period is said to be 20 years: does it mean that the deforestation rate will go back to the national average just after the project? In case the avoided deforestation would be calculated over the 20 years, then we would have to be careful with a relatively high result that would need to be justified (i.e demonstrating the capacity to reduce the deforestation by 50% with the available resources). A more conservative reduction rate may be suggested (ideally based on findings from comparable projects).
- Can you clarify the element "C" Land use change and community afforestation around the 10 ecovillages" as the described emission reduction all came from low carbon energy solutions?
- The project mentions 700 ha under improved practices (e.g. climate-smart agriculture) in the ecovillages. This should be included in Ex-ACT under the "crop production" and not in land-use change, as it is now.
- The values under sub-indicators 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 are all incorrect. Under 6.1. they should include emission reduction from all LULUC activities (from Ex-ACT) and under 6.2. they should report emission reduction from renewable energy (biomass, biodigesters). 6.3. reports energy savings in MJ (current value 72,094 corresponds to the emission reduction number from cookstoves in the Ex-ACT).

Response to Secretariat comments

ST_21/06/2019

The EXACT Tool has been revised:

- we now use the rate of deforestation in the Labé region (1.4%, source: Global Forest Watch / WRI)
- the accountability period is indeed 20 years. We changed it. According to the researchers from the Leeds University, the reduction of forest loss within PA is 17%. Hence this reduction rate has been used in the tool.
- We replaced with “c. Development of low carbon technologies”.
- The 700 ha of improved practices are now under “crop production” in the tool.
- These values have been changed: 6.1 includes carbon sequestered and emissions avoided from a) avoided deforestation and b) land use change; 6.2 includes emission from renewable energy.

Please refer to the EXACT tool sheet.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The project is coordinated with several initiatives and projects related to conservation and development, including PARSS3 with EU, the Combo project with WCS, Forest Trends, and Biotope, the BW, the PACV3, the UNDP GEF Biogas program, the West African Clean Cooking Alliance with ECREEE, etc.

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

- There is a sub-component on KM. However, we are not sure that the sub-objectives are pertinent for the project, as well as the proposed activities. The KM section should be revised in regard to the project objective and for the benefit to the conservation of the Bafing-Falémé landscape and the population of chimps. In this regard, a website, meetings, “communication and sensibilization spots” (not sure what it means), and participation of OGUIPAR in 3 international events on PA are not an appropriate response.
- We agree with an adaptive management process and the following objectives to: 1) identify and collate information generated by the project and other past and ongoing initiatives on biodiversity, PA, landscape approach, ecovillage biodiversity in Guinea and in West Africa, and 2) identify gaps with regard to biodiversity research and PA system interventions. We would like to suggest a third objective to share locally knowledge and practices on conservation and sustainable use of natural resources.
- We do not think that the following objectives are fully pertinent: (iii) further integrate or coordinate with other relevant national and international information and initiatives; (iv) further international bench-marking of the protected area interventions proposed under the project; (v) establish and maintain a first centralized, simple, open-access repository for information on the Bafing-Falémé landscape; and (vi) share project results and lessons with relevant national and international stakeholders.
- It is up to the Ministry of Environment and OGUIPAR to ensure this function of integration and coordination as part of their baseline investments. The use of project resources in this case to support OGUIPAR to attend three international events do not seem the optimal use of GEF resources. Here again, we suggest UNDP to empower the Ministry and OGUIPAR in their coordination missions, but also to empower local NGO/CSO, farmer organizations to share information and best practices.

Response to Secretariat comments

ST_21/06/2019

The sub-component on KM has been reformulated and re-oriented towards more specific results:

- production of best practices
- identification of further research needs
- sharing of best practices on conservation and sustainable use of natural resources through contracts with local CSOs.

We agree that the overall mission of integration and coordination should be ensured by the MEEF/OGUIPAR. The World Bank financed project under preparation will be partly directed to support MEEF on these aspects.

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement See comment item 2.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The project is not recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

July 1st, 2019: Technically all points are addressed. However, before being able to recommend the project for CEO endorsement, please address the following issues in the portal: see the table D and F, the columns "programming of funds" are empty. Please, correct.

July 8, 2019: It is a GEF-6 project initially set up in the PMIS and migrated to the Portal for CEO endorsement. If the Programming of funds column was not filled in in the first place in the PMIS, the GEF Agency may not be able to fill it in now in the Portal. Cleared.

July 16, 2019

Please address PPO's comments:

- On Core Indicators: For the sub-indicator 6.1, the estimate provided in the prodoc and Ex-ACT (15,435,599) does not match the estimate provided on the portal (1,841,255).
- The full emission reduction and carbon sequestration from 20 years should be considered as the target.
- Similarly, check the target for sub-Indicator 6.2.
- On Stakeholders: The Agency should enter their responses to the questions being asked in the Portal:
- On Gender: The Agency should enter their responses to the questions being asked in the Portal:
- On Co-financing; There is a typo on the name of the CSO. It should read Wild (not World)

24 July 2019:

We don't see the last comments from July 16 being addressed. Please check and ensure these comments are addressed before the next re-submission; Indicate in the "Response to Secretariat comments" boxes where in the portal the comments are addressed and highlight in yellow the added parts in the Portal.

29 July 2019:

Please check the GHG emissions mitigated:

1- There is still the result of 13,733,756 tCO₂ reported under indicator 6.2 (outside AFOLU sector) while this result comes from avoided deforestation. It should be considered under 6.1, where ALL the results from AFOLU sector should be reported (coming from avoided deforestation AND carbon sequestration). Under 6.2, we should find the GHG emissions mitigated from energy solutions.

2- There are discrepancies in the numbers:

- The total of GHG emissions mitigated is 15,435,599 tCO₂ in the prodoc and in the core indicators sheet in the Portal, but it is 8,996,484 tCO₂ in the Global Environment Benefits section in the Portal.
- What is the difference between 1,771,222 in the prodoc and 1,701,843 under core indicator 6.1 in the Portal?
- What is the difference between 72,476 in the prodoc and 72,094 under core indicator 6.3 in the Portal?

Please ensure the numbers are consistent in all the project information.

September 27, 2019

Addressed.

October 8, 2019:

The Quality Control found out additional comments to address:

1. Letter of cofinancing from Wild Chimpanzee Foundation: We are not asking for a new letter of cofinancing, because we discussed over the review process the role of WCF. However, please note that the letter is not clear on the nature of cofinancing. It should be clearly mentioned “grant”. And please, note that the notion of future cofinancing is not accepted at the GEF. We consider the cofinancing mentioned in the letter as a whole, and you will have to report on it on future Project Implementation Reports
2. Letters of cofinancing: when the letters are in French, please provide an informal translation.
3. On the M&E Budget (page 84 Pro-doc) - The M&E Plan includes some budget lines that either cannot be paid from the M&E (i.e. the Audit as it has to be paid from the PMC) or that are not applicable (i.e. tracking tools, as now procts have to report on Core Indicators). Please, check the budget items on the raws 1 and 5.
4. On Governance and management Arrangements (page 87 ProDoc) – Proposed Executing roll performed by GEF Agency – page 88 Pro-doc. UNDP is the Senior Supplier (this role is an executing function) which is not allowed.
5. The GEF has a procedure when a GEF Agency is performing direct project services. The procedure has not been followed here (justify, letter of support from the OFP, approval of the GEF Program Manager cleared by GPU Manager).
6. In the ProDoc – section Total budget and work plan - Contractual service individual make reference to Salaries for the Financial Officer, who is a Project staff. Salaries for project’s personnel have to be paid from the PMC (this project has \$598,000 of PMC) – please, amend.

November 21, 2019

All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

December 5, 2019

Please adress the two following comments:

- 1- On co-financing: we found all co-finance documents translated into English but one is still missing (Fouta Trekking Association – Ecotourism) – only the French version is available. Please ask the Agency to include the English version.

2- In the M&E plan, two items are not eligible: (i) monitoring of gender indicators (the Agency bundled this with project indicators); and (ii) translation of reports.

December 20, 2019

Addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

July 4th, 2019

UNDP is not able to fill out Programming of funds column in portal.

July 26th, 2019

All comments were addressed. Kindly see response matrix under documents section.

Spt. 24th, 2019

All comments were addressed.

November 11, 2019

1. OK, this is noted.

2. the UNDP did provide translations for all co-financing letters. This was part of the first submission. Nevertheless, they are re-submitted again.

3. The M&E table is corrected in both the ProDoc and the CEO endorsement request documents, by removing the Audit and Project board lines, and by correcting the reference to Tracking tool, changed to Core Indicators. Audit and Project board meetings are now budgeted within the PMC.

4. OK, this is revised, and UNDP is no longer the Senior supplier.

5. The letter of support from the OFP regarding Direct project services was indeed part of the first Submission. But nevertheless, after some discussions with the GEF PM and with the country, DPC has been removed from the project. There is no longer reference to DPC in the ProDoc. Budget table has been revised (pages 95-101).

6. This was not referring to a Finance/Administrative officer, which is indeed under the PMC. This budget line is mainly for handling the financial instruments regarding the Bafing-Falémé park financial sustainability. As indicated in the ProDoc, the project will facilitate the establishment of a trust fund to support the operational cost of the National Reserve. Note that the current budget line will not capitalize the trust fund, but rather, will provide the expertise needed for establishing it. Therefore, the budget line is revised and labeled “financial services” instead of Finance officer (page 98 of the ProDoc).

December 9, 2019

1. OK, English translation of the Fouta Trekking Association co-financing letter is now attached.

2. OK, these two items have been removed from the M&E plan.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Context

Guinea is one of the richest countries in West Africa with regards to biodiversity.

However, the gradual degradation and loss of natural habitat and disturbance to wildlife are exacerbated by poaching and unsustainable exploitation of some species, which has a wider impact beyond the immediate vicinity of villages. The agriculture and mining/energy sectors are the principal drivers of deforestation and biodiversity loss. Slash-and-burn, uncontrolled fires used to clear land for agriculture, the collection of firewood to feed the daily needs for cooking fuel in villages, coupled with the production of charcoal in peri-urban areas are a major concern for both natural resource management and climate change.

Key flagship species such as chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) have declined rapidly. Classified as “endangered” in 1988 by IUCN, the West African chimpanzees have been classified as “critically endangered with extinction risks”. These chimpanzees have already disappeared in Benin, Togo and probably in Burkina faso. Guinea remains the only West African country with a large number of chimpanzees (between 17,000 and 29,000). Half of this population live in the Fouta Djallon region.

Most rural villages in the Bafing-Falémé landscape (Middle and Upper Guinea) are extremely poor and struggle to break out of a cycle of poverty, emigration of young people seeking better lives elsewhere and unsustainable use of natural resources and energy. In order to escape from this cycle, village communities need solutions to develop and invest in new and sustainable forms of energy supply, more efficient energy use and improved livelihoods and income generation based on integrated and sustainable management of land and natural resources.

The Bafing-Falémé landscape is a place of growing interests for various sector (mining, hydroelectricity production, agriculture, biodiversity and ecotourism, infrastructure/roads, etc.), which, if well coordinated and managed, can become opportunities for sustainable development in this isolated region.

Project

The project will promote an integrated and sustainable management of natural resources by introducing a landscape approach, establish and make operational a cluster of protected areas (Middle Bafing National Park, Fauna reserve and community forests) along the Bafing and Falémé rivers, and establish Eco-Villages around the protected areas. The Eco-Village model, which embraces the concepts of integrated sustainable development (low carbon development, biodiversity conservation, income generation based on sustainable resource management), will be first introduced in the Republic of Guinea as a test model to feed into a national strategy for replication across the country.

The project is developed on the following four components: 1) Integrated Bafing-Falémé landscape management; 2) Making Bafing-Falémé Protected Areas and buffer zone management operational; 3) establishment of the Eco-Village model in the Bafing-Falémé landscape; and 4) Gender Mainstreaming, Knowledge Management and learning.

Global Environment Benefits

The project will expand and strengthen a total of 11,196 km² of PA in the Bafing-Falémé landscape (4.6% of the national territory), including 1) The implementation of the PNMB (6,426 km²), 2) The creation of the “Gambia Falémé” Wildlife reserve (3,372 km²) which will connect the PNMB with the existing and future PAs at the border of Senegal, and 3) the creation of three Community Forests for a total of 1,398 km². The project will contribute to the Guinea national commitments to cover 25% of the national territory under protected area management.

The project targets 6,000 ha of agricultural lands restored, 300 ha of forests restored, and 700 ha under SLM. Agro-ecology practices such as soil fertility enhancement through agro-forestry, crop rotation, will contribute to disseminate climate smart agriculture in the Eco-Villages of the Bafing-Falémé landscape.

It is estimated that, on a 20 year period, the benefits in carbon storage and emission reductions will be 8,996,484 tCO₂ for all 10 pilot Ecovillages.

Innovation, Sustainability & Scaling up

Both the landscape approach and the Eco-Village concept are innovative for Guinea. About sustainability: Reinforcing the capacities of the legitimate institution in charge of protected areas (OGUIPAR), building on a long-term partnership with a strong partner as Wild Chimp Foundation (WCF), and supporting local governments and local CSO (both for conservation and eco-development) are key-elements of sustainability. In terms of scaling and replication, lessons from the Bafing-Falémé landscape will potentially help to reinforce the national PA network, with a particular attention to the improvement of the management effectiveness of protected areas in the extreme far North-East of the Haute-Guinée (Bakoye watershed). This is the aim of the component 4 on KM.

GEF Strategies

The proposed project is consistent with the GEF6 BD Program 1.2 on protected area systems, LD1.2 on SLM for Climate Smart Agriculture, and CM4 on LULUCF.

Country priorities

Guinea used all their GEF6 STAR resources to develop this project.